

Com A N XXIV 104 12 13.
ANSWER
TO A
LATE BOOK,

Written by the Reverend

Dr. *SHERLOCK*,
Dean of CHICHESTER,

INTITLED,

*The Condition and Example of our Blessed
Saviour Vindicated, &c.*

R. Hoar, 173.
By BENJAMIN, Lord Bishop of Bangor.

L O N D O N :

Printed by *W. Wilkins*; for J. KNAPTON at the Crown,
and TIM. CHILDE at the *White-Hart*, in St. Paul's
Church-Yard. M DCC XVIII.

(Price One Shilling.)

AN XIA

ANSWER

TO A

LETTER BOOK

LETTER BOOK

DEAR MR. CHICKEN

INTRODUCTION

TO THE READER

BY THE AUTHOR

By BENJAMIN, Lord Bishop of Bangor

LONDON

Printed by W. B. M. at the Court
and the Church of the Holy Trinity in St. Paul's

CHRISTIANITY

(The Old Edition)



A N
A N S W E R

To the Reverend

Dean of *Chichester's*

Late BOOK, &c.



I Am very sorry to find my self obliged so soon to trouble the World again, upon a *Subject*, which has no relation to the *Main Cause*, into which it has thrust it self. But, as I think it necessary to reconsider what I last offer'd to the World, and to compare it with what the *Dean of Chichester* has replied to it : So, I hope, it will not be merely a Vindication of *My-self*, but may help accidentally to clear and fix some Point or other, not wholly unworthy of the *Reader's* Attention ; tho' I confess little expected by me to be brought into our *present* Debate, out of the Body of *Another*, of which

which it made, even at first, only an accidental and very inconsiderable Part. But thus it must be. I will always *step aside*, rather than be guilty of any Neglect towards the *Dean*: promising both *Him* and the *Reader* that it shall not lead me from the *Main Cause* now before the World; nor hinder me from returning to it, as soon as I see the *Whole* of what is likely to be offer'd upon it.

There are *Two Points* which the *Dean* proposes to *Himself*, in his last Book about the *Condition* and *Example* of our *Blessed Saviour*. The *First* is, to shew that the *Passage* I complain'd of, is not a *Calumny*. The *Other* is, to shew how much I have mistaken and misrepresented Our Saviour's Example. So that now, the *Great Controversy* about the most Important of All Subjects, both to the *Souls* and *Bodies* of Men, is for the present dwindled into a *Personal Debate* whether I did not, *Seven Years* ago, run into an *Extreme* in Controversy, and mistake the Nature and Application of our Lord's *Example*.

First, As to the *Calumny*. After the *Dean* has silently pass'd over, without the trouble of any Apology, his *Imputation* that I *writt down the Religion of Oaths*; and his *Invention* that I did it, *for this only Reason, because it stood in my way*; which implies in it my being void upon such Occasions of all Regard to what is *Right* or *Wrong*: After forgetting this, I say, the *Dean* defends the *Passage* I found fault with, from the *Crime* of *Calumny*, in the following Manner. "1. That the *Instance* there given of my
 "readiness to run to *Extremes*, is a very proper one.
 "2. That the Words quoted by Him, are My
 "Own Words. 3. That as they make an entire
 "Proposition of themselves, so do They contain
 "truly the Whole of what I assert. 4. That there
 "is nothing left out in His Quotation, that
 "can alter the Assertion, or make it other than it
 "appears

"appears to be." * To which I will add, 5. What He says, p. 16. in defense of his *Aggravation*, (which was indeed the heightening of the *Calumny*,) by adding in so shocking a Manner, *A Doctrine, which will make the Ears of a Christian to tingle! viz.* "that He will shew that my Assertion is as bad, as "Those Words of his represent it to be."

As to this last; the *Dean* attempts to prove it no otherwise, than by this, that "I have neither Reason, nor Scripture to support Me in my Assertion." Now He himself may see, I think, that this is a quite different thing; and raises a quite different Idea of *Me*, in the Mind of his Reader, than the *Manner*, in which He first chose to represent this to the World. Had the *Dean*, if this Doctrine of mine had come in his Way, only tax'd Me with being mistaken, and asserted that "I had neither "Reason nor Scripture to support Me"; I am certain that, as no one would have felt his *Ears tingle* at it, so I should never have complain'd of Him. But when He chose to place the Words, as He did, for the *Concluding Stroke* of a Conqueror; to put SLAVES in great Characters as well as SUBJECTS; to lift up his Hands and Eyes in print, with this moving Allarm, *A Doctrine which will make the Ears of a Christian to tingle, &c.* He must pardon Me, and all Mankind, if We find a quite different Movement upon this Occasion.

To the *First* of these *Allegations*, My Answer is, 1. Whether this be an Instance of my readiness to run to *Extremes*, in the true Spirit of *Opposition*, as the *Dean* is pleas'd to say; I think no one can judge, who does not know my Heart. Whether it can be prov'd to be so much as a *Mistake*, depends upon the *Truth* of what the *Dean* alledges in the following Parts of *this Book*; and therefore, He should

* P. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

not have taken it for granted that this was an *Extreme* to be condemn'd, before He had prov'd it so: but should first have prov'd it so, and then have argued upon it. 2. That the *Great and Learned Adversary*, from whom it was my Unhappiness to differ in that long past *Controversy*, must here suffer, under the same *Condemnation*, from a *Writer*, who wishes his *Chastisements* may fall only upon *Me*. For if it be running to an *Extreme* to say that *Christ's Example* was more peculiarly fit to be urg'd to *Slaves*, than to *Subjects*; then, it is equally so, to affirm that it is more peculiarly fit to be urg'd to *Subjects* than to *Slaves*: This being an *Extreme*, as well as the Other. And yet that *Excellent Writer's* Argument from *St. Peter's Words*, turn'd upon this. 3. If it be a sufficient Proof of my Inclination to *Extremes*, to urge, as the *Dean* does, p. 8, that I had not made that *Affertion*, unless an *Objection* had been drawn from *Christ's Example*, against My own *Doctrine*: If He pleases, I will confess that I had not spoke so much as one *single Word* about it, upon that *Occasion*, unless *Objections* had been drawn from it. And I will the rather confess that I was led to that *Extreme*, as He calls it, by the *Course* of my Argument; because the same *Great Man* must here likewise be content to suffer with me. For He runs into his *Extreme* plainly and professedly in answer to a *Difficulty* which press'd Him in his Argument, viz. that *St. Peter's Words* were directed to *Slaves*, and not to *Subjects*; and therefore, the *Example* of *Christ* which back'd his *Directions*, was more peculiarly given to *Them*. And at this rate, the *Dean* and All *Controvertists* may be prov'd to be very ready to run into *Extremes*, from their continual taking occasion from the Arguments or *Objections* of their *Adversaries*, to lay down such *Affertions* as they would not lay down, were they not answering to something which led directly to them.

But

But I am particularly content to suffer with *One*, from whom both the *Dean* and *My self* may learn all the Ornaments that the greatest *Wit* and most *Beautiful Expression* can give to a *Writer*. But, 4. supposing this to be an Instance of my Readiness to run to *Extremes*; this has no part in my Complaint of *Calumny*. I did not complain in *that* manner, of being barely represented as too ready to run into *Extremes*. I have pass'd over an hundred such *Charges* as this. But what I complain'd of, was my being represented, upon that Account, in so remarkable and so shocking a manner, to the *Reader*. To proceed,

To the *Second* and *Third* I answer, That tho' the *Words* quoted by the *Dean*, are my own *Words*; tho' they do make an *Entire Proposition* of themselves; tho' they do truly contain the *whole* of what I assert, in short: Yet, I had just ground to complain of the *manner* of the thing; and the *Representation* made of *Me* to the *People* from hence, by the help of *Capital Letters*, and *Exclamations*; and particularly by the *Omission* of Others of my *Words* all around them. For the Case is this. Had the *Dean* only design'd to shew the Falshood of my *Proposition*, and my *Mistake*, I could not have complain'd of *Injustice* in having the *Proposition* first laid down in *Words* sufficient to express it. But, as his Design was to represent *Me*, and not to argue against my *Doctrine*; as his Design here was *Personal*, to set me out as one offering *Indignity* to our *Lord*; I must presume to say that it is not a sufficient *Vindication* to alledge that They are my own *Words*, and a *Complete Proposition*: because the *Manner*, the *Circumstances*, the *Reasons*, upon which *My Words* are founded, are in this Case necessary to the *Reader's* forming a *Judgment*, whether I have *ill-treated* our *Blessed Lord's* Example in a *shocking manner*; all the World knowing that an *Expression* taken alone, and suppos'd to be

be abruptly and coarsely used, is *shocking* : which same *Expression* may be far from it, when qualified with all the Circumstances around it. I am sorry therefore, to see the Dean endeavour to make his Reader believe that I “ *accused Him of Calumny*, “ *FOR producing my own Words*, p. 59 ; and p. 36, “ *FOR quoting my own Words* : When He knows, in his Conscience, it was *not for that* ; but for *producing My own Words*, in a *manner*, so little favourable, shall I say ? I have long learn'd not to complain for want of *Favour*. No. In a manner so *cruel*, as by the help of *them*, and a short *Allarm* of a *Comment*, to show Me to the *People* as *One* who had not *scrupled* to offer *Indignity*, and *Personal Indignity*, to Our Blessed Lord and Saviour, only to help my self out of a *Difficulty*.

To the *Fourth* I answer that, Tho' there be nothing in the Dean's *Quotation* it self, that can alter the *Affertion*, or make it *Other*, than it appears to be to those who have read it, as it is in the Book from whence it is taken : Yet, in the manner of quoting it ; in the preparing the Reader for some terrible thing ; in the citing it by it self without either the *Occasion*, or the *Reasons*, given for it ; in the adding an *Exclamation* upon it ; in the Representation of it as a *Personal Indignity* to our Lord himself ; the *Affertion* is made to appear very shocking, very terrible, and indeed quite *Another* thing than it appears in the Book it self. For tho' the *Addition* of my *Reasons* would not, it is true, have alter'd the *Affertion* ; yet it would have alter'd the *Shockingness*, and the *supposed Indignity* of it offer'd to Our Saviour. The *Addition* of them would not have alter'd the thing it self : but the *leaving them out* has entirely alter'd the *Manner* and *Effect* of the *Affertion*. For *this*, I can only appeal to Those, both Friends and Enemies, who, being allarm'd with this *Imputation* of the Dean's, immediately
turn'd

turn'd to the *Passage* it self ; and found their *Sentiments* quite alter'd, and their *Astonishment* turn'd quite another way. And of several such Persons I do assure the *Dean* I have heard : who, tho' not inclined to favour *Me*, yet are Persons of too much Honour and Humanity, to give into the Ungenerous Method of sinking a *Personal Character*, instead of answering to *Arguments*.

To the *Fifth* I have answer'd already, That supposing *Me* to have been so mistaken, as that " I have " neither *Reason*, (which I wonder to hear mention'd in the present Case,) nor *Scripture*, to support me ; " yet this doth not justify the *Representation* I complain of. *This* is no more than, that I am mistaken : which is the common Lot of the *Best* of Men. But it is turn'd into a *Calumny*, or a *Personal Infamy*, when I am represented as opposing something in a very shocking manner, " for this " ONLY Reason, because it stood in my way ; " (for thus it is introduced) as " making no scruple " merely upon *this* account, to affirm something of Our Lord's Example, which is declared presently to be " a *Doctrine*, which will make the Ears of a " *Christian tingle* ; " and a Warning against One, who is " so fond of his own Notions, as to take " such Steps to defend them . " Who does not see the difference between charging a *Writer* with having run into a *Mistake*, for which He has not the support of *Scripture* ; and setting him forth in the other manner, as not scrupling the most shocking thing, with regard to Our Lord himself, merely to get rid of an *Objection* ? In the one Case, there is nothing but what must be between All *Writers* who differ : But in the Other, there is a Charge of No *Regard* to Our Saviour's Example, if it stand in my way ; of not scrupling to throw a *Personal Indignity* upon Him, only in order to answer more fully to an *Objection*, which I had answer'd sufficiently without

it ; and of venting a *Doctrine*, (solely for so low a Reason,) which will *make the Ears of a Christian tingle* : and *this* represented, in so moving a manner, to the *Passions* of the *People*, as could not but raise them to a very high pitch of Displeasure and Indignation.

And now, If this be not *Personal Reproach*, to a degree which well deserves the name of *Calumny* ; if this be not a Manner of *Representation*, which raises in the Minds of *Readers* quite different *Ideas*, and *Commotions*, from what the *whole Passage* it self would do ; if this does not turn their *Thoughts* from the *Idea* of a *Man* mistaken ; or, of a *Man* too apt to run into *Extremes* ; to the *Idea* of a *Man*, who does not stick at saying the most shocking Things upon the most sacred Subjects, for this ONLY Reason, because an *Objection* stands in his way ; of a *Man* who *makes no scruple* (which implies in it a degree of *Wilfulness*) to fix *Personal Indignities* upon *Christ* himself, and to vent a *Doctrine* which will *make the Ears of a Christian to tingle*, solely to get rid of a trifling *Difficulty* : I confess, I know not what the *Nature* of a *Calumny* is ; and will retract my *Charge* much more freely than I made it. But on the contrary, if the *Dean's Account* be allow'd, that, provided you keep to a *Person's Words*, and so order it that they make an *entire Proposition*, and express his Sense ; You may, without *Calumny*, represent Him in as bad a Light as possible, only by leaving out all those *Circumstances* which are known perfectly to take off from the *Shockingness* of an *Assertion* : Then, I will undertake, in some Instance or Other, to set forth any *Writer* in the grossest Colours *Resentment* can invent, without a Crime ; and, if I may say so, to *calumniate*, as much as I please, without being afraid of the Imputation of *Calumny*.

What the *Dean* alledges, from *p. 10.* to *p. 16.* I shall consider, by and by, in its due place.

Secondly, In *p. 16.* the *Dean* comes to the *Second Point*, viz. To shew that "I have neither Reason nor Scripture to support Me, in the *Affertion* "He blamed." And here, before He begins, He undertakes "to shew his Reader what *My Affertion* amounts to, by giving *My own* Explications "of the Terms of *My own* Proposition." What can be more just, or more kind, in appearance, than this *Proposal* is? And yet in reality, He does no such thing. "By *Slaves*, He says, I mean *Slaves* properly so call'd; i. e. such as are bought in the Market, "or taken Captive." This seeming very odd, when join'd with the Great Name of Our Blessed Lord, He preserves this particular *Idea*, and puts it, at full length, by way of *Interpretation*, into *My Affertion* about Our Lord's Example. And, by the help of it, He makes *Me* to have asserted, "That the Example of Our Lord is much more fit for such as "are bought and sold in Markets, (as if I had spoken of *Slaves*, consider'd under that Notion particularly,) "than for such as have Civil Rights and "Properties," *p. 17.* "This *Affertion* (He then "adds) is very SHOCKING to a Christian, as being "highly dishonourable to Our Blessed Saviour. And "one of the Bishop's Reasons of this *Affertion*; "That the New Testament represents the Humiliation "and low Estate of Christ ——— by the Condition of "Slaves, i. e. of such Slaves as are bought and sold "in the Market, is equally bad, equally dishonourable to our Blessed Saviour, as will soon appear." What is to appear, We shall see by and by. The present Point is the Reasonableness of explaining *My Affertion* in this Manner: Upon which I offer the following Observations.

1. That it is no great sign of the Shockingness of a Proposition, when, in order to make it appear, the

Term, in which the whole *Shockingness* is couch'd, must be explain'd by a *Partial Definition*, and have that *Definition* put into its place. 2 That the most innocent Assertion may be thus made the most *Shocking*, if it has a *Term* in it, to which *several Ideas* are annex'd; by chusing *that Idea* which is most for the Purpose, instead of *that* which the *Asserter* himself constantly chose. 3. This is the Case here. I do indeed, in opposing *Slaves* to *Subjects*, and in stating the difference of their Conditions, speak of *Slaves*, as *bought and sold in the Market*, or *taken Captive*. But in My Assertion relating to the *Example of Christ*, I speak of *Slaves* under the *Notion* of the *lowest and most helpless part of Mankind*, in their constant Condition, and by the very nature of their Station: and never once, upon this Occasion, mention *That*, which was proper only when I was defining the difference between *Them* and *Subjects*. So that tho' it be literally true that I do, upon another Occasion, describe *Slaves* as *bought and sold in the Market*: yet, it is as literally true that the Word *Slave*, with this Idea peculiarly annex'd to it, is not any one of the *Terms* of my Assertion, which the *Dean* so kindly undertakes to explain; but that the *Notion* of *Slaves*, in my Assertion about our Lord's *Example*, is the *Notion* of *Persons*, the lowest and most helpless, and most miserable of *Mankind*, by the nature even of their daily and constant Condition of Life. My Assertion therefore, is not (as the *Dean* is pleas'd to represent it,) "That the *Example of Christ* is much more fit
 "for such as are bought and sold in Markets, than
 "for such as have Civil Rights and Liberties:" but,
 "That the *Example of Christ*, with respect to that
 "low and helpless Condition, in which it pleas'd
 "him to appear, and to suffer, is more peculiarly
 "fit to be proposed to *Those* who are, in their daily
 "ly and constant Condition, the lowest and most
 "help-

"helpless part of Mankind; than to *Those* who, "consider'd as *Civil Subjects*, have *Rights* and *Privileges* and *Remedies* belonging to them, of a much "higher and more comfortable Nature." This is the *Explication* of the *Terms* of My Assertion, with respect to Our Lord's Example: and This not now *first* alledg'd; (tho' even *that* would be but an equitable Demand, that I might explain My own Sense thus, if it did not contradict any of my former *Explications*;) but plainly delivered and laid down at the very time of making the *Affertion*.

4. And thus it is likewise with the Account the Dean is pleased to give of One of my Reasons for My Assertion; which He says is this, "That the *New Testament* represents the *Humiliation* and low *State* of Christ by the Condition of *Slaves*;" i. e. says He, "of such *Slaves* as are bought and sold in the *Market*." Whereas He knew, tho' He would not transcribe my own Words for his Reader, that the Sentence of mine which He quotes, runs thus, "by the Condition of *Slaves*, the *lowest* and *most* *helpless* part of Mankind. This was the *Notion* I join'd to the Word *Slaves* in this Assertion of mine; and upon which I founded the Propriety of it: and not the *Notion*, which alone He produces as mine, for his own Reader; and which yet, I never once mention in what relates to our Lord's Example.

5. So that if the *Indignity* or *Dishonour* to our Lord, is founded upon this particular *Idea* (*bought and sold in the Market*) being annex'd to the word *Slaves*; as the Dean here clearly explains his meaning: then it is manifest, I have offered no such *Indignity*, because I have not once annex'd this *Idea* to that *Word*, in speaking of Our *Blessed Lord's Example*; but the *Idea* of Persons in the *lowest* and *most* *helpless* Condition of Humane Life. 6. The Dean may as justly chuse out any one of the very grossest Offices required of *Slaves*, hardly fit to be express'd

press'd in Words ; and accuse me of saying that the *Example* of Christ is more fit for Persons employ'd in such an Office, than for Subjects. For this would be literally true that I had affirm'd *this*, with respect to *Persons*, who may be sometimes employ'd in such a particular Office. And yet it would *not* be true that I said this of *Them*, considered as *so* employ'd ; in which the whole *Shockingness* of the *Proposition* would consist. But, 7. Supposing that the *Indignity* or *Dis honour* to our Lord were founded upon the considering of *Slaves* under this particular Notion, of Persons *bought and sold in the Market* ; this is equally a *Dis honour* and *Indignity*, when it is affirm'd in the *positive degree*. And consequently, the *Dean* himself must equally partake with *Me* in the Crime. For, the *Dean* allows that " He that says *The Example of Christ is fit to be proposed to Slaves*, says what is very true, p. 11. that is, He allows that " *The Example of Christ is AS fit to be proposed to such as are bought and sold in Markets, as to such as have Civil Rights and Privileges.*" And if this be true, it not only *may*, but *ought* to be said : as He acknowledges. Now, if the *Dis honour* done to *Christ* depends upon this particular Circumstance of *Slaves* always implied in this Assertion ; then I would beg to know, (not as to the *Truth*, which is quite another Point, but as to the *Indignity* done to our *Blessed Lord* ;) how it is possible that there should be more *Personal Dis honour* done to *Christ* by saying this in the *Comparative degree*, than by saying it in the *Positive*. It is very plain, as it is here made to depend upon a particular *Idea* ; the *Dis honour* done to *Christ*, by the *Dean Himself*, must be *equal* to that done by *Me*. But if this cannot be understood ; I hope at least *thus much* will be clear, that the *Dean* is guilty of the *same Crime*, tho' in something a less degree. For it is impossible that any *Great Dis honour* should

should be done to Our Blessed Saviour in affirming his Example to be *more* fit for *Slaves* than *Subjects*; which I am here suppos'd to have done: unless *some* degree of *Disbonour* be done to Him by affirming *His Example* to be AS FIT for SLAVES as for SUBJECTS, which the *Dean* has done more than once; and is very free to allow me to say. So that when He condemns *Me*; He, according to Custom, condemns himself.

And now, having shewn that He has not "given My own Explications of the *Terms* of My *Affertion*, as He profess'd to do; but has indeed made it appear *Shocking*, by leaving out the particular Notion, under which alone I always consider'd *Slaves* in that *Affertion*; and by putting in another *alone*, in its stead, which I never once made use of, for this purpose: It will be proper to shew the Reader, that my own Words, in the *Original Passage*, from whence the *Dean* ought to have taken my true Meaning, agree with the Account I have now given of it. In my *late Vindication* of my self from his Injury, I produce that whole *Passage* out of My Former Dispute: So that I need only refer to what the Reader will find in that *little Piece*. In the *Quotation* there made,* it will be seen that I express'd my self thus. "Our Lord's voluntary Humiliation is COMPAR'D to that of a SERVANT." Again, "When his LOWEST Estate is describ'd, the ALLUSION is made to the Circumstances of "a SERVANT." "When St. Paul is to give the "liveliest REPRESENTATION of his Confession and HUMILITY, it is done in these "Words, *He took on Him the Form of a Servant, "or Slave.*" Again, "The Lowliness of our "Lord's Condition" is the thing spoken of. A-

* P. 10, 11, 12, 13.

gain, " By whose Condition He is pleas'd to
 " DESCRIBE his own Low Estate." Again, " He
 " is said, with respect to his lowest and most mis-
 " erable Condition, to have taken on him their Form;
 " and, under that humble APPEARANCE, to have
 " suffer'd, &c." After this I add, p. 13. as one of
 the Foundations of what I had said, " That the
 " New Testament REPRESENTS the HUMILI-
 " LIATION and Low Estate of Christ, in this
 " World, by the Condition of *Slaves*, the lowest
 " and most helpless part of Mankind ". It ap-
 pears from All this, 1. That I confine my *Ob-*
servation to the *Humiliation*, and low Estate of
Christ in this World: That, as to this One Instance
 of a Low and Helpless Condition, in which it
 pleas'd our Lord to appear, His *Example* was of
 peculiar Use to Those whom I consider always in
 the lowest and most helpless Condition of humane
 Life, by the nature of their *Station*; and not mere-
 ly by the accidental Vicissitude of Worldly Affairs.
 2. That I have been as far, as the *Dean* himself,
 from asserting Our *Blessed Saviour* to have been re-
 ally a *Slave*. Nay, I have guarded expressly against
 it, by declaring his *Humiliation* and Suffering to
 have been *Voluntary*, and infinite Condescension;
 and Himself to have had no *Lord* or *Master*, to
 whom He could be supposed a *Servant*, or a *Slave*.
 Yet am I forced to observe this, because the *Dean*
 has argued against Me, in some Parts of his Book,
 very seriously, as if I had asserted what I have in-
 deed denied in express Words. 3. That I have not
 asserted that our *Saviour*, in his Life upon Earth,
 went amongst Men under the Character of a *Ser-*
vant; or that He always *personated* One; or any
 thing like it: Which I observe, because a great part
 of the *Dean's* Argument supposes Me to have laid
 down such Assertions as *These*. 4. That I assert the
 Lowness of his *Condition* to be REPRESENTED, or
 Dr.

DESCRIBED by that of *Slaves*; that it is COM-
PAR'D to it; that the ALLUSION is made to it:
all which Words plainly shew that my Application
of this to Our Saviour was in a *figurative* and not
a *litteral* manner; and design'd to refer to *some* Cir-
cumstances of his Condition; not to his whole *Cha-*
rafter, nor every Circumstance of his Life; nay,
nor to Every Circumstance belonging to that low
and suffering Condition, so described. And this
it will be proper to apply to those Arguments of
the *Dean*, in which He opposes me, as asserting
That to have been said *litterally*, which I plainly
assert to have been said only in a *figurative* Style.

Having thus plainly stated What it is that I
have asserted; I now proceed to examine what
the *Dean* alledges against the several Points I have
laid down, * as the *Foundation* of my Assertion,
“ That the Example of Christ is more peculiarly
“ fit to be proposed to *Slaves*, than to *Civil Sub-*
“ *jects*.”

1. The *first* is, That St. Peter expressly proposes
the Example of our Blessed Lord to *Slaves*. 1. To
this the *Dean* answers, “ This may be true, and
“ yet nothing to my purpose; for it is *one* thing to
“ propose it, and *another*, to propose it as much
“ more peculiarly fit,” &c. And this would indeed
be a very *Good Answer*; were it not, that I have ne-
ver once put this as a *Reason* by it self for my *As-*
sertion; but that I mention *four* Points as the Sup-
ports of it: The *second* of which in particular, is
absolutely necessary to that Argument of mine,
which depends upon this *first*; and they both
together always go into it. I never argued that
the Example of *Christ* was more fit for *Slaves* than
for *Subjects*, merely because St. Peter speaking to
Slaves, as *Slaves*, applies it to Them: but because

* *Answ. to a Cal. p. 13.*

He does this in *their* Case; and because, in speaking to *Subjects* as *Subjects*, neither *He*, nor any other *Apostle*, proposes it. The Argument therefore, is this. The *Apostles* do it in *one* Case, and do it *not* in *another*. Therefore, it was more *proper* in *one* Case, than in *Another*. And it relies upon this, that the *Apostles* knew, and made use of, the *proper* Considerations in every Case they expressly handled. But the *Dean* leaves out this, which is the Support of my Assertion: and then,

2. Puts a Case, "Should a Physician expressly prescribe the *Jesuits Bark* for a *Servant* who has an Ague; would his Lordship infer that *Jesuits Bark* is much more peculiarly fit for a *Servant's* Ague, than for a *Master's*." To which He might well answer for me, that "I would not." But I beg his leave to make *another* Answer for my self; viz. that this Case is as distant from the Case I was concern'd about, as it is well possible to be. The Ague of a *Servant*, and the Ague of his *Master*, cannot possibly be supposed *different Distempers*: But the *Station* of that *Servant*, and the *Station* of his *Master*, are certainly different *Stations*. Therefore, the Ague of a *Servant*, and the Ague of a *Master*, do not at all answer to the Condition of a *Slave*, and the Condition of a *Civil Subject*. But then, the Case it self ought to have been put thus; to have made it *parallel* to that before us. "Should any *Infallible Physician* expressly prescribe the *Jesuits Bark*, as the Best Remedy for a *Servant* who has an Ague; and should the same *Infallible Physician* *Not* prescribe the *Jesuits Bark* for his *Master*, in some Distemper He labour'd under:" And if it be put thus, I should not scruple to argue from thence, that there was some difference in their *Distempers*; and that the *Bark* was more peculiarly proper for the *One*, than for the *Other*. And this indeed answers to the Case before Us. But the *Other* does not.

3. The

3. The *Dean* attempts to prove that *St. Peter* speaks to *Domesticks* of all sorts, from his using the Word *οἰκέται*, and not *δῶλοι*: Which He shews, from *Stephens's Thesaurus*, to signify, not only Servants, (*θεράποντες*) but all that belong to the Family: even those who are free; and not so much as *θεράποντες*, serving in any Office. To this He adds, that the Word for their *Masters* is not *κύριοι*, but *Δεσπόται*: which, I wonder, he did not rather avoid mentioning, because it is certainly a Word peculiarly importing a high and arbitrary Power; even higher than is implied in the Word *κύριος*. But to this Argument from the Word *οἰκέται*, I answer, 1. That He himself very well knows that the Original, or first large Signification of a Word, is no Argument against the confin'd Sense of the Word, appropriated afterwards by Use: and that the *Etymological* Sense of a Word, is no Rule to go by against *Custom*. 2. That it is observable, The *Dean*, tho' with *Stephens's Thesaurus* before Him, does not attempt to produce one single *Passage* out of any *Greek Author*, in which the Word *οἰκέτης* is used in any other Sense, but that of a *Slave* properly so called. 3. That supposing *οἰκέται* to be still kept in a Sense thus general in it self, and to be so used upon several Occasions; which it is not: yet it may be restrained by the *Circumstances* of a Sentence; and by other words made use of, to which it immediately and necessarily relates. And, even upon this Supposition, This would be the Case in *St. Peter*. For in the first place, It cannot here signify *All* in the Family. It is too great an *Absurdity*, for Instance, to suppose *St. Peter* to write here to *Wives*, because he speaks to Them particularly afterwards: and yet They are included in this general Signification. It is as absurd to suppose Him to write to Those who were as *Lodgers*; or to Those who were in no Serving Office in the Family; in order

to move and induce them to bear Injuries and Abuses, from a *Master* of a *Family*, to whom They were under no *Obligation*, and out of whose *Jurisdiction* They might rightly remove themselves whenever they pleas'd. And yet, by the *Dean's* Criticism, *St. Peter* was urging upon *Lodgers*, and upon Those not in a state of Service, the Duty of being subject to their *Masters*, in all *Fear*. From these Absurdities, I hope, He himself will see plainly that the *Word*, οἰκέται, tho' in it self it should be supposed to be of a General Extent, yet must of necessity here not be understood in that Comprehensive Sense. And besides this, It is also positively confin'd by all the *Circumstances* around it. The οἰκέται here mention'd are expressly said to be under *Masters*, who are called, with respect to *Them*, Διοπάται. Their Duty is express'd by ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντί φόβῳ, being subject in all *Fear*. Their *Treatment* is supposed to be such, as was common from the *Lords* of *Slaves*, express'd by κυλαφιόμοις and πάχοντες; and, in the Application of *Christ's* Example to them, the Expression made use of is, *By whose Stripes ye were healed*. [In the *Greek* it is express'd by the Word μώλωπι, which signifies the *Mark* or *Spot*, remaining after the servile Punishment of *Beating*, &c.] Now no Persons in the *Family*, I think, except *Slaves*, can be here describ'd by All these Concurrent *Circumstances*. But indeed, 4. οἰκέτης will, I believe, appear to be the proper *Word* for a *Slave*, and at first design'd to be appropriated to a *House-Slave*; as δουλός seems to be the general *Word*, denoting the *State* of *Servitude*, without the particular *Confinement* of the *Slave*. I will give a few Instances of this *Confinement* of the *Word* οἰκέτης, which, as far as I can find, is constant. Nothing could be easier than to multiply *Quotations* out of the *Profane Authors*, by whom I believe it will be found to be used for a *Slave*, without any Variation; and

from

from whom, I find, the *Dean* himself does not alledge one single *Passage*, in which any good *Author* has us'd the *Word* in that Comprehensive Sense, which He would now put upon it, out of *Etymologists*, and *Commentators*. But I think it better to give a few plain *Instances* from the *Hellenistic Greek* of the *Old Testament*, which is followed in the *New*. Levit. xxv. 39. the word *δουλεία* is joined with *οικέτης*, as properly explaining what is contained in it. *If thy Brother be sold unto Thee, & δουλεύσει σοι δούλειαν οικέτης*, He shall not serve Thee with the Slavery of an *οικέτης*; but shall be as a *μισθωτός*, or *Hired Servant*, in the Verse following; so that the known Signification of *οικέτης* was a *Slave*. Ib. v. 42. They are my Servants, [*οικέται*.] Then follows & *παραθήσεται ἐν πρᾶσει οικέτης*. He shall go free, and not be sold to another with the Sale of a Bond slave, or an *οικέτης*. This is very remarkably to be observed by the *Dean*, because it shews that the *οικέται* were *Slaves*, bought and sold in the Market, between Man and Man; an *Idea* which He loves to join to the word *Slaves*, in this Controversy. Again, Deut. xv. 15. and, xxiv. 18. *οικέτης ἦσθα ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐλυτρώσατο σε Κύριος*. Where *οικέτης* is a *Slave*: and the word *ἐλυτρώσατο*, which implies a *Price* paid for Freedom, tho' figuratively used here of Almighty God, shews that *οικέτης* was a *Slave* to be bought, and redeem'd with Money.

To these I will add but one single Instance out of the *New Testament*, and that is in St. Luke. xvi. 13. *ἐδείς οικέτης δύναται δοῦναι κυρίοις δουλεύειν*. Where the *Dean* will, I dare say, take notice that the [Servant] *οικέτης* at the beginning of the Verse, is describ'd, at the End of it, as one whose Office it was *δουλεύειν*, to serve; and that the *Master* of this *οικέτης* is called here *κύριος*, which He seems to like better than *Δισπότης*. So that this one Verse out of a *Gospel* written originally in *Greek*, is enough to answer all his

Cri-

Criticism, p. 18. For here οἰκέτης is the same with ΔεσλⓈ: and his Master is κύριⓈ, the same with Δεσπότης in St. Peter. And I hope this constant Usage of the Word, in the *Hellenistical Greek*, in Places where it can signify nothing but a Slave, is a much better proof of the particular Sense, in which St. Peter must use it in the Passage before us, than the first Etymological Sense of a Word, (without one single Passage out of any Author to prove it to be confirm'd by Custom,) can be of the contrary.

After this Criticism upon the word οἰκέτης, the Dean adds, p. 19. "that, if St. Peter had used the Word ΔεσλⓈ, He shall shew that even That Word could not reasonably have been confined to such Slaves: i. e. to Slaves properly so called." In what Sense He means this; and how He performs it, will appear in the sequel of his Argument, when we come to the Heads, under which He undertakes to do it.

In the mean while, before we proceed to his next reasoning, I will do my self the Honour to observe, that the Learned and Great Man, to whom I was answering in this part of a Former Controversy; He, whose Abilities to judge of the true meaning of the Apostle's Words, and whose Sagacity to find out every reasonable Advantage to his Cause, All the World acknowledges; that He, I say, in his Latin Sermon, is far from doubting, but takes it for granted, all thro' his Argument, that St. Peter's οἰκέται, were Slaves. *Servi* is the Word by which He all along renders the Greek Word. Their Masters He expresses by *Domini*, and *Heri*. These *Servi* were such as could be punish'd with particular Punishments, *Privati Domini Jussu*; such as *Herili imperio suberant*. He calls them once *Famuli*, which is the Word for House-slaves, answering to οἰκέται; and so understood by Him, as appears from all that He saith: unless any Critick will think it enough to give us the Etymology of *Famuli*, and alledge that

the

the Word might possibly signify once, *All in the Family*, whether in any Office of Service, or not. What I have mention'd this for, is to draw an Argument in my own Favour, that, in supposing St. Peter to speak here to *Slaves*, I did but follow that *Great Man*, with whom I was then debating; that I took the Signification of the *Word*, as He put it; that I was then arguing with *Him*, who put that Sense upon the Word, and not with the *Dean*, who does not: and that I may argue from hence, not only to shelter my self in general under so good an Authority, but to shew that I did (what is right and reasonable in every Dispute) take the Word in *that* Sense, in which My Adversary had understood it; and go on in the Argument, taking it for granted to be rightly interpreted, without the trouble of any *Critical Disquisition* about it. And therefore, supposing it were *not* thus to be understood; yet, as I argued with *One* who *did* thus understand it, I did nothing but what is allowable, in following Him in that Interpretation: and All the *Dean's* Criticisms will not at all affect *Me*, but a much greater Man, whom I followed. To proceed,

4. The Dean's next Argument is this. *p. 19.*
 " Suppose St. Peter did speak to *SUCH* Slaves; yet
 " 'tis certain that He does not propose the Example
 " of Christ to them, as peculiarly fit for *Them*, con-
 " sider'd as *Slaves*. For the Reasons given by
 " St. Peter, why the Example of Christ should be
 " followed, are such as affect all Men equally, and
 " have nothing in them peculiar to Slaves; *p. 20.*
 " Particularly because Christ is not *peculiarly* Bishop
 " of the Souls of Slaves; and because many extra-
 " vagant Absurdities follow from supposing St.
 " Peter to recommend the Example of Christ as pecu-
 " liarly fit for Slaves. " *p. 21.* Add to this, what
 the Dean here further urges, that " St. Peter, in the
 " fol-

“ following Chapter, after considering the Duties
 “ of Husbands and Wives, speaks to All sorts of
 “ Christians ; v. 8. and at v. 18, He proposes to
 “ All the Example of Christ. At Ch. iv. v. 1.
 “ He again makes a General Application of the
 “ Example to All Christians.” And from hence the
Dean forms his Argument, “ He that proposed the
 “ Example of Christ’s Sufferings to all sorts of Chri-
 “ stians in *this* manner, could not possibly propose it
 “ as much more peculiarly fit for *Slaves* &c.” In an-
 “ swer to all this I observe,

1. That the *Dean* is pleas’d in this Passage to
 contend against *Me*, as if I had urged that St. *Peter*
 expressly proposes the Example of Christ as *peculi-
 arly fit for Slaves* : whereas the Assertion which he
 quotes from p. 17, and which He is here professing
 to consider, is barely this, That St. *Peter* expressly
 proposes the Example of Christ to Slaves, properly so cal-
 led. My Argument does not rely on this solely,
 but, as I have shewn, upon my next Reason join’d to
 it. But as to This, in particular, what does He
 now say to it? He is so far from denying it, that
 He grants it to be true ; that “ St. *Peter* does ex-
 “ pressly propose the Example of Christ to Slaves,”
 as He here for the present supposes the Word to
 signify. And then He proceeds, after having allow-
 ed that St. *Peter* does this in One Case ; and before
 He has attempted to prove that the *Apostles* have not
 avoided the doing it in another ; He proceeds, I say,
 to shew that it is falsely affirmed that “ St. *Peter* re-
 “ commends the Example of Christ, as peculiarly
 “ fit for Slaves, in contradistinction to All other
 “ Christians.” Which is not My Proposition ; even
 as He himself set it down two or three Pages
 before, in order to confute it. That Proposition
 still stands good, notwithstanding any thing here
 advanced : because it may be very true, as the
Dean acknowledges, that “ St. *Peter* does expressly
 pro-

"propose the *Example of Christ to Slaves* ;" tho' it may be false that " *St. Peter* himself recommends " this Example, as peculiarly fit for Slaves." The former is *my Proposition*. The latter is what the *Dean* chuses rather, in *this Place*, to amuse his Reader with. In *this place* I say: For,

2. This Conduct is the more remarkable, because the *Reader* will find, before He comes to the End of his Book, that the *Dean* himself, after having argued against *Me* here, in *p. 20, 21*, as if I had insisted upon this, that " *St. Peter* himself expressly " recommended *Christ's Example*, as peculiarly fit " for Slaves ;" being press'd by *Another Writer*, whose Favour He was willing to conciliate to himself, contends earnestly, *p. 52*. that " My Words " do *Not* affirm, with respect to *St. Peter*, that the " *Example of Christ is more peculiarly urged by Him,* " *to Slaves than to Subjects* ; but do affirm, with respect to the Nature of the Example it self, That it " *is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves than* " *to Subjects.* " And when He sums up the Point, *p. 54*. " So that here (says He) the matter in " Question plainly was, not this — How *St. Peter* had applied the Example — but this — " To which of the two Cases, the Example, in its " Nature, was more peculiarly applicable. " I cannot but wonder that, in so short a Book, and in a Book written in so few days, and at a time when what He resolv'd chiefly to insist upon must be strongly impress'd upon his Mind: that the *Dean*, I say, should within the Compass of so few Pages, thus forget himself. In *p. 20, 21*. When no Difficulty press'd Him, He chose to go from the *Proposition* He had undertaken to consider ; and voluntarily to enter into an Argument against *Me*, as if I had insisted upon it, that *St. Peter* expressly proposes *Christ's Example* as more peculiarly fit for *Slaves*, than any *Others*. *P. 21*. The *Dean* says, " If

D

" his

“ his Lordship’s *Reason* be good, St *Peter*’s Argument must stand thus”——that is, as it follows, St. *Peter* does himself expressly propose this Example, as more peculiarly fit for *Slaves*, than any Others. Now My *Reason*, if I understand it, was the *Reason* which He quotes from me, p. 17, in order to consider it. And that *first Reason*, as He himself cites it, was “ That St. *Peter* expressly proposes the Example of Our Blessed Lord to *Slaves*.” So that what He here lays down is, That “ if St. *Peter* expressly proposes this Example to *Slaves*,” then St. *Peter* himself expressly proposes it to *Them*; as something more peculiarly fit for *Them*, than for Any other Rank of Christians: Whereas, whatsoever I have said about St. *Peter*, no such thing as this either was, or can be, deduced from the *Reason* or *Proposition* abovemention’d. Again, in the same page, “ so that (says the *Dean*) if the Example of Christ be peculiarly here (that is, by St. *Peter*) applied to *Slaves*,” &c. still arguing against Me as affirming *That*. And in the next Sentence, He speaks of “ the Extravagant Absurdities following from supposing St. *Peter* to recommend “ the Example of Christ, as peculiarly fit for *Slaves*,” carrying on the same Argument against Me, upon the same Supposition. This, I say, in p. 20, and 21. is an *Argument* voluntarily taken up against Me, as affirming this of St. *Peter*. But, in p. 51, and 54. all this is forgot; and it is declared to another *Adversary*, that My Words affirm no such thing; that “ in all the long *Paragraph* of My *Former Dispute*, I do not once argue from the Example of “ Christ, as applied by St. *Peter*,” and that “ the “ matter in question was not, How St. *Peter* had “ applied the Example.” If that was not the matter in *Question*; I’m sure, it could not enter into My *Affertion*, or *Conclusion*, according to the *Dean*, in p. 54. The Summ of the matter is this. I might affirm

affirm that *St. Peter* proposes the Example to *Slaves*; which was my Proposition; without affirming that He himself expressly proposes it, under the notion of something more peculiarly fit for *Them*, than for *Others*. I might affirm that the Example is, in its own Nature, more fit to be proposed to *Slaves* than to *Subjects*; which was another of my Propositions; without affirming that *St. Peter*, in this place, expressly proposed it, under the notion of something more peculiarly fit for *Slaves* than for *Subjects*. And therefore, the *Dean* has departed from my Sense, in arguing against Me, in *p. 20.* as affirming what is not at all implied in the Proposition of mine, which He had before Him: and this, at his own Expense, because it is in direct Contradiction to the Account which He himself gives (in *p. 51, &c.*) of My Doctrine. But,

3. Another Great Mistake here is, that the *Dean* argues against Me, as if I had affirmed the Example of *Christ* to be more peculiarly fit to be urged to *Slaves* properly so call'd, than to *Any others* in the whole number of Mankind: whereas, my Comparison relates only to *Slaves*, and to *Civil Subjects*, consider'd as such. And my Affirmation was, that the Example was more peculiarly fit to be urged to *Slaves*, whose constant Condition makes Them always subject to great Pressures and Injuries; than to *Civil Subjects*, who, according to My Notion of them, have Properties and Privileges of a very happy Nature, and a Right to defend them; and who, consider'd as *Civil Subjects*, have no such Misfortune or Misery annex'd to their Ordinary Condition. Now, tho' this be declared with respect to *Civil Subjects*; yet, it does not follow from any thing I have said, that there cannot be any sort of Men in an Unfortunate Condition, tho' not properly *Slaves*; to whom yet it may be equally proper to apply That Example.

4 Taking it now for granted that *St. Peter*, in proposing *Christ's Example*, does it in such a manner, as supposes it to be proper for *All Christians*: What follows from hence? 1. It follows that it is equally proper for *All* in the same present Circumstances of *pressure* and *want*; for all in the same sort of difficulties, which They either cannot at all, or cannot honourably, get rid of; whether by their former Condition, *Slaves*, or *Kings*: and this, in order to encourage Them to bear those Evils patiently. That is, it is proper for *All*, who by any Methods are reduced to the Condition of *Slaves*, so far as to be distressed and helpless. 2. It does not at all follow that this *Example* is not more peculiarly fit for *such*, as are more peculiarly in a state of Misery, by the nature of their Ordinary and Constant Condition: that is, for such as are in the Condition of *Servitude*. 3. It does not follow that the *Example* is as proper to be proposed to a *Body of Civil Subjects* vested with *Rights*, in order to their *silent Submission* to all *Tyranny*, (which was the very Point in *Question*,) as to *Those* who are, by the nature of their ordinary Condition, *Slaves* to the *Will* of a *Master*, and *Helpless* under the greatest Injuries. 4. What is sufficient, in answer to all that is here alledg'd; It does not at all follow that, because the *Example of Christ* is proposed to *All* in Any sort of Sufferings that They may be exposed to; that, I say, *therefore* it is not more peculiarly fit to be proposed to *One* sort than to *Another*, considering each sort in their ordinary and general Circumstances. The *Dean* knows that I have, more than once, acknowledg'd the *former* of these. But I think it very clear that these two following *Propositions* are as Consistent as any *Two* in the nature of things. "The *Example of Christ* is proper to be proposed to all Christians in a suffering Condition." And, "The *Example of Christ's Patience* is

" more

" more peculiarly fit to be proposed to Persons who
 " are peculiarly, by the nature of their Condition,
 " exposed to Misery, and helpless under ill Usage,
 " than to *Those*, who, consider'd in their ordinary
 " Condition of Life, are not so". And besides this,
 5. Tho' St. Peter, in speaking to *Slaves*, and urging
 the *Example* of *Christ*, expresses himself in several
 such Words, as are as proper for urging this upon
Others, as upon *Them*; yet neither will *this* prove
 that He did not propose the *Example* as something
 peculiar to *Them*; (tho' I have never affirm'd,
 He did *expressly* so apply it:) because the speaking
 of it, as belonging to *All* in distress, is no more
 in effect, than the declaring it to be proper for *All*
Christians, whensoever They may be in such a *Con-*
dition of suffering, as the Ordinary and Constant
 State of Servitude exposes *Slaves* to. And this ra-
 ther implies the peculiar Fitness of the Example for
Them, than the *Contrary*. These *Slaves* being *Chri-*
stians, the *Apostle* might make use of several Expres-
 sions in which they were in common concern'd
 with all other *Christians*; and yet make use of *some*
Others, in which They were peculiarly concern'd, as
Slaves; and apply the *Example* as more peculiarly
 adapted to their *Ordinary Circumstances*, than to those
 of *other sorts* of Men; even whilst he mixt something
 with it, which shew'd its *general Use* to all Christi-
 ans. And therefore, the *Dean's* putting in the
 Words *Slaves*, and *Slaves peculiarly*, into his *Para-*
phrase upon the *Passage*, and annexing these Words
 to some of those of St. Peter, in which those *Slaves*
 had only a common part, as *Christians*, does not
 at all hinder the particular Application of the *Ex-*
ample; any more than it would do, to put a *suffer-*
ing Person in mind that *Christ* suffered for *Us all*:
 which yet might, I presume, be very consistent with
 designing to apply the *Example* of *Christ* as a pe-
 culiar Lesson of *Patience* and *Resignation* to Him, in
 his

4 Taking it now for granted that *St. Peter*, in proposing *Christ's Example*, does it in such a manner, as supposes it to be proper for *All Christians*: What follows from hence? 1. It follows that it is equally proper for *All* in the same present Circumstances of *pressure* and *want*; for all in the same sort of difficulties, which They either cannot at all, or cannot honourably, get rid of; whether by their former Condition, *Slaves*, or *Kings*: and this, in order to encourage Them to bear those Evils patiently. That is, it is proper for *All*, who by any Methods are reduced to the Condition of *Slaves*, so far as to be distressed and helpless. 2. It does not at all follow that this *Example* is not more peculiarly fit for *such*, as are more peculiarly in a state of Misery, by the nature of their Ordinary and Constant Condition: that is, for such as are in the Condition of *Servitude*. 3. It does not follow that the *Example* is as proper to be proposed to a *Body of Civil Subjects* vested with *Rights*, in order to their *silent Submission* to all *Tyranny*, (which was the very Point in *Question*), as to *Those* who are, by the nature of their ordinary Condition, *Slaves* to the *Will* of a *Master*, and *Helpless* under the greatest Injuries. 4. What is sufficient, in answer to all that is here alledg'd; It does not at all follow that, because the *Example* of *Christ* is proposed to *All* in Any sort of Sufferings that They may be exposed to; that, I say, therefore it is not more peculiarly fit to be proposed to *One* sort than to *Another*, considering each sort in their ordinary and general Circumstances. The *Dean* knows that I have, more than once, acknowledg'd the *former* of these. But I think it very clear that these two following *Propositions* are as Consistent as any *Two* in the nature of things. "The *Example* of *Christ* is proper to be proposed to all Christians in a suffering Condition." And, "The *Example* of *Christ's* Patience is

" more

" more peculiarly fit to be propos'd to Persons who
 " are peculiarly, by the nature of their Condition,
 " expos'd to Misery, and helpless under ill Usage,
 " than to *Those*, who, consider'd in their ordinary
 " Condition of Life, are not so". And besides this,
 5. Tho' St. Peter, in speaking to *Slaves*, and urging
 the *Example* of *Christ*, expresses himself in several
 such Words, as are as proper for urging this upon
Others, as upon *Them*; yet neither will *this* prove
 that He did not propose the *Example* as something
 peculiar to *Them*; (tho' I have never affirm'd,
 He did *expressly* so apply it:) because the speaking
 of it, as belonging to *All* in distress, is no more
 in effect, than the declaring it to be proper for *All*
Christians, whensoever They may be in such a *Con-*
dition of suffering, as the Ordinary and Constant
 State of Servitude exposes *Slaves* to. And this ra-
 ther implies the peculiar Fitness of the Example for
Them, than the *Contrary*. These *Slaves* being *Chri-*
stians, the *Apostle* might make use of several Expres-
 sions in which they were in common concern'd
 with all other *Christians*; and yet make use of *some*
Others, in which They were peculiarly concern'd, as
Slaves; and apply the *Example* as more peculiarly
 adapted to their *Ordinary Circumstances*, than to those
 of *other sorts* of Men; even whilst he mixt something
 with it, which shew'd its *general Use* to all *Christi-*
ans. And therefore, the *Dean's* putting in the
 Words *Slaves*, and *Slaves peculiarly*, into his *Para-*
phrase upon the *Passage*, and annexing these Words
 to some of those of St. Peter, in which those *Slaves*
 had only a common part, as *Christians*, does not
 at all hinder the particular Application of the *Ex-*
ample; any more than it would do, to put a *suffer-*
ing Person in mind that *Christ suffered for Us all*:
 which yet might, I presume, be very consistent with
 designing to apply the *Example* of *Christ* as a pe-
 culiar Lesson of *Patience* and *Resignation* to Him, in
 his

his present Circumstances. But I have said enough to every one of the Arguments propos'd against my *First Reason*.

II. The *Dean* comes to consider my *Second Reason*, p. 22. viz. "That in mentioning and handling the Duty of Subjects, consider'd as Civil Subjects, neither He (St. Peter) nor any other Apostle ever once proposes the Example of Christ's passive Submission and Non-Resistance." And here again, I must observe,

1. That the *Dean* uses this Proposition just as He did the last. He first makes it by it self a distinct Argument, as well as a distinct Proposition: and then, He asks very justly, "If Christ's Example be not peculiarly fit for Subjects; must it needs therefore be peculiarly fit for Slaves?" But did I argue after this manner at all? No. But My Reasoning was this. St. Peter expressly proposes the Example of Christ's Passive Submission to Slaves. Neither He, nor any other Apostle, proposes it to Subjects, consider'd as Civil Subjects, in order to press Passive Submission upon Them. Therefore, That which the Apostles did in One Case, and avoided to do in the Other, may reasonably be supposed to be more adapted to that One Case, to which they apply it, than to that Other to which they do not apply it. I attribute it to his haste in writing, that He could suffer himself thus to triumph over an Argument, which He himself first made so weak, as not to be worth triumphing over.

2. He goes on, p. 23, "But in truth, the Example of Christ's Sufferings is proposed just as much to Subjects, consider'd as such, as it is to Slaves consider'd as such." I have shewn that, in speaking to Slaves, with regard to their Masters; and to that Usage which was ordinary in their State; St. Peter does expressly propose the Example of Christ to Them. Now it lies upon the *Dean* to shew, in
con-

contradiction to My *Proposition* at present before Him, that, "in mentioning the Duty of Subjects to their Civil Governours, the *Apostles* propose the "Example of Christ's Passive Submission, as their "Rule." What I find alledg'd, now follows.

1. "The Reasons given by St. *Peter*, to enforce "Christ's Example, are such as equally concern all, "whether *Slaves*, or not. And the Example is expressly propos'd to All." This I have already consider'd: and shall only observe farther, that this is just as if it should be argued, The *Example* of Christ's Patience is propos'd to All, That is to All, who are actually in a suffering Condition, out of which They cannot, either at all, or honourably, release Themselves: Therefore, it is propos'd to All in another Sense; even to *Civil Subjects* consider'd as such, in order to reconcile them to a *Passive Submission* to those Evils, which they are not obliged to submit to, consider'd as *Civil Subjects*. For this was the *Point* in hand.

2. It is urged that "It had been most certainly "a very invidious thing for the *Apostles* directly "to have said that Governours would be injurious "to their Subjects; and might have drawn upon "Christians the Indignation of the Powers of this "World. For this Reason St. *Peter* SEEMS purposely to avoid (as St. *Paul* does likewise) putting the Case of *Unjust Princes*." p. 23, 24. And here the honest and upright *Apostles* are represented as Men of great *Address*, who would not in plain Words tell *Subjects* their Duty, as *Subjects*; but artfully and dextrously couch'd it under their Directions to *Slaves*, or Servants to *private Masters*. The *Dean* goes on to give *Reasons*, why "He is the more INCLINED to think that this was really his design: viz. Because after "having LARGELY treated "of the Duty of *Subjects*, from v. 13. to v. 17. inclusively, He throws in the Case of Servants and "hard

“ hard Masters in one single Verse, and goes immediately, within a Verse or two, to the Example of Christ, and urges it upon Reasons common to all sorts of Christians, &c.” That is, as if it should be argued thus. *St. Peter*, in treating *LARGELY* of the Duty of Subjects, speaks not one Word of *Tyrannical Magistrates*; nay, I will add, speaks of *Magistrates* expressly under another Notion, as engaged in a very useful Office. He then makes a full stop, and proceeds to the Case of helpless *Slaves*: and there speaks plainly of *Hard Unjust Masters*. And then, and not till then, *within a Verse or two*, [The *Dean* might have said, after *three Verses* relating to *Slaves*, which contain very near as much in them as the foregoing *five* relating to *Subjects*, and which particularly mention a *slavish Punishment*,] proposes the Example of *Christ*, &c. Therefore, *St. Peter* intended not to speak plainly, where He *professedly* speaks to *Subjects*; but artfully, in *another Passage* belonging to *Others*, to *insinuate* an *Odious Case*, about *Civil Governours*, for fear of offending the *Powers* of this World too much. I must beg leave here to observe,

1. That *My Proposition* which is now before the *Dean*, and which He has in appearance and profession undertaken to confute, is confirm'd by all this. The *Proposition* is, that “ In handling the Duty of Subjects, consider'd as such, the Example of *Christ's* silent and *Passive Submission* is not proposed to *Christians*, by any of the *Apostles*.” The *Dean* here acknowledges it. But for fear this should be too great a Favour, He finds out Reasons why They *SEEM* “ purposely to avoid putting the Case of *Unjust Princes*: and why He himself is *INCLINED* to think that this was great Address in Them, &c.” But since They only *SEEM* thus to act; and the *Dean* is only *INCLINED* to think thus; I beg leave to observe that *My*

Proposition stands good, and that these *Reasons* signify nothing to invalidate what is built upon Their open, actual Practice, unaccompanied with *Surmises* and Suppositions of what *my own Side* of the *Question* makes me INCLINED to wish. But,

2. If this *Great Address* in *St. Peter* were couch'd so obscurely, that *Subjects*, as such, could not see their *Concern* in it; then it was all invain. And if it were so express'd, as that it might be plainly seen to be design'd for *Subjects*, as such; and the *Unjust Masters* of *Slaves* to point out *Unjust Civil Governours* over *Subjects*; then, to what purpose was this *Address* in the *Apostle*? Since, if *Subjects* could see this *Reference*; their *Governours* might see it as clearly: and consequently, this very Method here taken must have been as *Invidious*, and as effectually have set the *Powers* of this World against the *Christians*, as the other Method, supposed to be avoided? Nay, It would have been found more *Invidious*, more *Dis honourable*, and more *Displeasing*, than the *Other* more *Open* manner of doing it.

3. If *this* were a sufficient Reason for the *Apostles* not putting the Case of *Unjust Princes*, because their *Christian Subjects* would fare the worse for it: It was likewise as sufficient against the *Apostles* mentioning *Unjust Masters*; because the putting the Case of *Unjust Masters* would make *Them*, it seems, much worse to their *Christian Slaves*. But I see that, when the *Apostles* thought it proper to speak to *Slaves*, They did not use such an *Address*, merely for fear those *Slaves* should suffer the more for it: And therefore, I cannot conceive that any such Reason could have prevented their speaking as plainly in the *Other* Case. Nor do I believe that, in laying down necessary Duties, They did ever, in such a manner as the *Dean* is pleased to be inclin'd to believe, *Cauponate the Word of God*.

4. St. Peter himself gives such an *Account* of the Office of the *Magistrates*, whom He considers as sent for the punishment of *Evil doers*, and for the praise of them that do well; that it is highly improbable that He thought of applying to *Them*, what is hardly consistent with *this Account*; and what would destroy this very view, in which He chuses to consider *Them*; and so to leave *Them*, as He found *Them*, bounded, both in their *Duty* and *Authority*, by the Nature of their Office.

5. St. Paul's Practice is worth remarking, who when He suffered alone, in his own Rights only, as a *Civil Subject*, was so far from thinking that *Christ's Example* was to be followed by Him, as a *Civil Subject*, in those particulars in which St. Peter recommends it, in *this* and the *next Chapter*, either in particular to *Slaves*, or in general to *All Christians* in distress: so far from this, I say, that he did open his Mouth, and threaten, and insist upon his Rights, in a very high and stiff Manner. But,

6. The *Whole* of the *Dean's Inclination* and *Supposition*, in *this Place*, is founded upon what in fact the Experience of all Ages has found to be quite otherwise. In our own Age particularly, we have had much upon *this Subject*. We have seen the Case of *Unjust Princes* publicly put, to the highest degree of *Total Ruine*; and *Absolute Submission* press'd, upon *this Supposition*. Did any One Prince as yet, ever take this amiss? unless it has been so explain'd, as to appear that He himself could not be the *Prince* intended to be serv'd by it. But generally, how greedily has this *Incense* been receiv'd? And how much *Favour* has it procur'd to Those who have offer'd it? The *Complement* is indeed in it self very indifferent, to make the *Supposition*. But, when *Obedience* is press'd, and *Submission* inculcated, upon this Occasion; Few *Princes* have been seen to shew any *Anger* to those who have professedly done it:

it: But many have been their *Encomiums*, and *Honours*; and extravagant the Satisfaction that has been expressed in it. I appeal to all who know *Humane Nature*, or *Humane Politicks*; whether *St. Peter*, or *St. Paul*, could have made a more acceptable Present to *Nero* or *Caligula*, than the absolute disposal of the Lives and Fortunes of All their Subjects: a Present, which would not have been at all diminish'd in its value, by its carrying along with it the Implication, that They themselves might possibly be Bad enough to attempt to be Masters of them. And to the same I appeal, Whether any thing could have more conciliated such *Magistrates* to the *Christian Name*, than to have found the *Greatest Submission* inculcated, in All possible Cases, upon *Christians* consider'd as *Subjects*; and the *Example* of *Christ's* Silence and Non-Resistance proposed so much for the *Temporal Advantage* of such Rulers. This would have been so far from being *Invidious*, or raising the *Anger* of the *Great Ones*; that it would have appeas'd it, if it had been already rais'd. And therefore, I conclude would have been done by the *Apostles*, if it could have been done agreeably to the End of *Society*, and the Design of *Christianity*. The *Example* of *Christ* was not urg'd by Them, in this Case, in which it would have given *Christianity* an Advantage in the *Eyes* of *Princes*: But it was done, in *Another*. Therefore, I still conclude, It was more peculiarly fit to be urg'd in that *Other*, than in *This*.

3 The remaining Point urg'd by the *Dean* upon this *Head* is, that " *St. Peter* applies the *Example* of *Christ* to *Christians*, suffering under the Civil Powers for Righteousness Sake; and that our Saviour Himself had so applied it," before Him. *St. Peter* particularly, after having said, *Let none of you suffer as a Murtherer, &c.* which must have reference to the *Civil Magistrate*; adds in the next

Verse, *Yet if any Man suffer as a Christian, &c.* which also the *Dean* supposes must be under the *Civil Magistrate*: [tho' the *Apostle* speaks of *Reproaches*, as well as other *Sufferings*.] He observes likewise, that Our *Lord* speaks of his *Disciples* being brought before *Kings and Governours*, Matth. x. 18. Let all this be granted: and still the *Answer* lies very plainly before Us. For,

1. It needs but very little Consideration, to see that there is a great difference between a Man's suffering as a *Christian*, and as a *Civil Subject*: between his suffering under a *Civil Magistrate*, for Righteousness Sake; and his suffering under the same *Civil Magistrate*, as a *Civil Subject*, and in that Capacity. My Proposition was not this, that the Example of *Christ* was never proposed by the *Apostles* to *Christians*, suffering as *Christians*; whether under a *Civil Magistrate*, or under the Oppressions of Any others. But My Proposition was, that "in handling the Obedience and Non-Resistance of *Civil Subjects*, consider'd as *Civil Subjects*, the Example of *Christ's* Silent and Passive Submission was never proposed to *Christians* as their Rule. A *Christian* who suffer'd merely as a *Christian*, suffer'd for something which he had peculiarly as He was a *Christian*. But suffering as a *Civil Subject*, He suffered in something which He had in common with all others of his Station, and in which They were concern'd with Him.

2. This will be more plain from *St. Paul's* Practice: Who seems to Me, in his own Conduct, to have made a manifest distinction between Himself consider'd as a *Christian*; and Himself consider'd as a *Civil Subject*, vested with the Privileges of a *Citizen of Rome*. As a *Christian*, I hope it will be allowed that He was as ready to follow *Christ's* Example in his Sufferings, as Any one could be. But as a *Civil Subject*, He consider'd in Himself
the

the Rights of *Others*; and was so far from following His Great Master's Silence, and Passive Submission, when those *Rights* were touch'd, even in no very great Instances; that He complain'd and remonstrated in a very threatening manner. *Act. xvi. 37. xxii. 25.*

3. When St. Peter has advised the *Christians*, to behave Themselves so, as not to be condemn'd and punish'd as *Malefactors*; He adds, *Yet if any Man*, (if any of You) *suffer as a Christian*: i. e. If it be so, that Suffering for the sake of *Christianity* must be your Portion, and you cannot honourably avoid it; then, says He, *Let him not be ashamed*. Had it been said, "If the *Civil Magistrate* invades your Rights and Privileges, which you enjoy in Common with other Subjects; If he attacks you consider'd as His *Subjects*; or the like: In all such Cases, follow the Example of Christ's Silence and Submission, and be not ashamed, but think it your glory to assist in the good Work of giving up all the Rights of Inferiors to the arbitrary Will of *Superiors*"——If it had been thus expressed, some Argument might have been drawn from hence against what I have laid down. But when it only relates to Suffering as *Christians*, upon the sole account of *Christianity*; I confess, I can see no relation in it to the present purpose, except that accidental One, that Christians might suffer as Christians, under the *Magistrate*; as well as from their *Fellow-Subjects*: which is indeed *Verbal* only.

4. Christ's *Example* therefore, can be propos'd to Them, when they are call'd before Kings and Governours for his *Names Sake*, only as an Example of Patience and Fortitude, and Glorifying in a good and honourable Cause. It is propos'd to Them, in their suffering as *Christians*, expressly: not as to their Conduct, consider'd merely as *Subjects*; which is still left by *Christianity*, to the *Laws* of Reason, and the Original of *Humane Society*. 5. The

5. The same Application, (the *Dean* observes, p. 26.) belongs to *Slaves*: the Example of Christ being urged upon *Them*, according to my own Confession, not to oblige them to submit in *All* Cases; but “to put them in mind of the Glory of suffering Injuries patiently, and in many Cases, of preferring *that* before a violent Redress:” as my own Words are, in the *Page* here quoted by the *Dean*. “And let any Man (He adds) now consider the Case, and tell me what could carry His Lordship into so strange an Assertion as this, *That the Example of Christ is much more peculiarly fit for Slaves than for Subjects?*” I think it very plain that I was carried to it, because I found that the *Apostles* did propose it, in their *Directions* particularly applied to *Slaves*, spoken to under that Character; and did *not* propose it, in their *Directions* to *Subjects*, expressly spoken to as *Subjects*: And because the Ordinary and Constant State of *Servitude*, is a Poor, Low, Helpless, Miserable Condition of Life, in it self, generally and not accidentally bearing resemblance to that Afflicted and Helpless Condition, into which it pleased the Great Lord of Life and Death to put Himself, for the peculiar Comfort and Support of Those who most stood in need of Comfort and Support in this wretched World. And if the *Dean* had pleased always to consider it in this view, I think there had been but little need of troubling the World about the *heinousness* of my *Offense* in dropping once a short Passage accidentally to this Purpose.

At the Conclusion of this part of His *Argument*, the *Dean* “hopes, He has said enough to make me reconsider what I seem to affirm, that the Example of Christ’s Sufferings is never proposed in *Scripture*, to *Subjects*, and always to *Slaves*.” Always to *Slaves*, I have never yet affirmed. But I have *reconsider’d* what I have affirm’d: and I find,
My

My *Proposition* was this, " That in mentioning
 " and handling the Duty of Civil Subjects, confi-
 " der'd as Civil Subjects, neither *St. Peter*, nor any
 " other *Apostle*, ever once proposes the Example of
 " Christ's Passive Submission and Non-Resistance."
 Against this, the *Dean* has seem'd to argue: But has
 indeed *first* acknowledg'd that in speaking to *Civil*
Subjects, expressly as such, The *Apostles* have not
 done this; and *then*, has confirm'd what I had said,
 by only giving Instances of *Christ's Example* being
 propos'd to *Christians* in general; to *Christians* suf-
 fering as *Christians*, (not to *Civil Subjects* as such)
 for Righteousness Sake; which must extend to
 Them, as well when They suffer for being *Christians*,
 from their Equals and Neighbours; as under the
Civil Magistrate. And consequently, *He* cannot find
 any thing in *Scripture*, which at all contradicts what
 I have said.

III. The *Dean* proceeds, in *p. 29.* to My *Third*
 Reason: Which is this. 3. " That the New Te-
 " stament it self REPRESENTS the Humiliation
 " and Low Estate of Christ in this World, by the
 " Condition of Slaves, THE LOWEST and most
 " HELPLESS part of Mankind; and never once
 " by the low Estate or helpless Condition of Civil
 " Subjects, as such;" &c.

The *Dean* here again gives his *Reader Notice*,
 that by *Slaves* I mean (that is, I mean in this Sen-
 tence) *such as are bought and sold in Markets*. As if,
 because I once, in another part of the Dispute, de-
 scrib'd *Slaves* as such; therefore, I must always an-
 nex this sole Idea to that Word. On the contrary,
 I beg the *Reader* to take notice that, in *this very Pro-*
position now before the *Dean*, the Notion under
 which I consider *Slaves*, and which I have here ex-
 pressly added to the Word, is that of the LOW-
 EST and most HELPLESS part of Mankind: the
 LOWEST, as employ'd in the lowest Offices of mi-
 nistring

nistring to Others ; and the most HELPLESS, as being consider'd, in their *ordinary* State, as Persons not vested with any *Privileges*, or *Properties*, for their own Support and Defense. From hence ; and from what I have before said, in order to determine and shew in what Sense I have affirm'd this ; the *Reader* will easily answer all that here follows. And,

1. The *Dean* considers a *Passage* in *St. John*, *ch. xiii.* in which " Our Saviour is pressing his own Example, " in one of the *most servile* Things that ever He did " upon All his Disciples." The Instance is that of His *Washing their Feet*. Upon which He observes, that " this Example of our Lord, in so *Servile* an " Employment, is so far from being founded in a " Representation of his Estate by the Condition of " a Slave, that it is really inconsistent with it. For " one who was to personate a Slave could not say " what our Lord does, Consider what I your Lord " and Master have done, not as bound in Duty, " but out of Love and Humility. A Slave cannot " urge his Love or his Humility in doing what " his Condition requires of Him.—Our Saviour " pleads his Example, not looking on Himself as " a Slave, but as a Lord and Master." All this, I must beg leave to say, appears very strange to Me ; who have never, as I think, given Occasion for it. But I must answer to it. And,

1. I never once thought of representing Our Blessed Lord, either as really a Slave ; or, as looking upon Himself as a Slave ; or any thing like to this. 2. I always spake of Him as a Lord, and Master ; and of his Humiliation, and *Ministring* Actions, as Voluntary Condescensions. 3. The *Dean* Himself represents Him here as doing a *Servile* Office. So that I hope He, who not being really a Slave, performs a *Servile* Office, may be said, in that, to personate a Slave.

4. It

4. It is so far from being true, as the *Dean* alleges, that *One who personates a Slave*, in doing such an Office, *could not say as Our Lord does*; that the very Reason why He Himself could speak so, was because He *personated One*, in that *Servile Office*: because, being in reality their *Lord and Master*, the *Slave* was only *personated*, in this Action; and the *Form* of a *Servant*, only put on. I confess therefore, that I cannot apprehend what the *Dean* means by saying that “ One who was to personate a “ Slave in washing of Other’s Feet, tho’ He might “ recommend this Example of Submission to his “ Duty, yet could not say, Consider what I your “ Lord and Master have done, not as bound in Duty, but out of Love and Humility, &c.” I say, I cannot conceive the Meaning of this, when the very contrary is evident, *viz.* That He who *personates a Slave* in washing Other’s Feet, cannot recommend his own Example of Submission to this, as to his *Duty*, because the *personating a Slave* necessarily implies in it, that He is not really one, and that this *Action* is not his *Duty*: And likewise, when I have never spoken, upon this Occasion, of Our Saviour’s *personating a Slave*, in any other Sense, but that of his infinite *Condescension* in putting himself Willingly into that *Low, helpless, Ministering Condition*, in which *Slaves* find themselves unwillingly, and by constraint. It is very true therefore, what the *Dean* adds, that *Our Lord’s* Exhortation to his Disciples “ is not an Exhortation fit for a SLAVE “ to make. A SLAVE cannot urge his great Love, “ or his great Humility, in doing what his Condition requires of him” &c. But all this is so far from any Answer to what I laid down, that it confirms it: unless the *Reader* should be moved by what I am sorry to see come from the *Pen* of a Man of such *Abilities* and such a *Character*. For as this is perfectly New in the *Dean*, to represent Me here, as

F

if

if I had said that Our *Saviour* was in reality a *Slave*; or that He did not look upon *Himself* as by Right a *Lord* and *Master*, even in all his *Condescensions*; the very contrary to which is necessarily implied in his *Personating* a *Slave*: So, He must be a *Reader* of a very low Form indeed, who can find himself so overclouded by what is here urged, as not plainly to discern that a *Lord* and *Master*, doing a *servile Office* out of *Love* and *Condescension*, does in *that Office* *personate* a *Slave*; and that this is the very Reason why He can and may express himself so, as One who is really a *Slave* could not, and ought not to do. Every thing indeed, that the *Dean* alledges here, is as if He had design'd to confirm what I have really said.

5. It is to be observ'd, that this *servile Action* of Our *Blessed Lord's* was not design'd to stand by it self, but to be a *Lively Representation* of the *Condescension*, *Love*, *Humility*, *Beneficence*, of his whole *Life*; of his readiness to do all good and helpful *Offices* to Others, and to stoop to the assistance and support of Others: *personating* in all this, One of Those, who were oblig'd in *Duty* to Minister to others.

2. And this leads us to consider what the *Dean* urges, p. 32. upon *Matth. xx. v. 24.* where Our *Blessed Lord*, having proposed to his *Disciples* the being a *Servant*, or *Slave*, to others, as the way to the greatest Honour in his Kingdom; not the being really a *Slave*, but the *personating* One so far as to do the lowest *Offices* of *Beneficence* to others willingly and by *Condescension*; which *Slaves* are forced to do, by *constraint*: He proposes his own *Example*, in the general Conduct of his *Life*. Even, as the *Son of Man* came not to be ministered unto, but to Minister, and to give his *Life* a *Ransom* for many. The *Dean's* Note is here again very surprizing. "Where, (says He,) his *Ministry* and his *Death*
" are

“ are not represented as the Consequences of a
 “ *slavish Condition*, but of a *generous Condescension*. Our
 “ Lord ministred to them, not as one *bought in the*
 “ *Market for Servitude*, but as Chief among them,
 “ and doing the Work, not of *Necessity*, but of
 “ *Love*.” The Dean here goes on, either greatly
 to mistake, or greatly to injure Me. If I have never
 once (I say, *never once*,) thus spoken, upon this
 Subject; I hope, He will forgive Me, if I say, He
 must answer for such *Representations* as these. Nay,
 I have never spoken any otherwise of Our Lord’s
Ministring, that is, his *Ministring* to the Necessities
 of Others, than as the most *Generous*, and *Willing*,
 and *Infinite Condescension*. The Force of the *Exam-*
ple I always found upon this *Condescension*. And the
Fallacy is very plain here likewise. For,

1. The Great *Condescension* of Our Blessed Lord,
 for the sake of Others, answers to the State of a
Slave, or ΔΕΛΟΝ, into which He advises his Disciples *fi-*
guratively, not really, to put Themselves, when the
 good of others requires it. 2. His Great *Condes-*
cension is represented by his *Ministring* to, or *serving*
 Others, which was the Office of *Slaves*; and an-
 swers to the Office of a ΔΕΛΟΝ in the Verse before.
 3. These Words are made use of, and the *Allusion*
 is made to the State of a *Slave*, in order to signify
 that the *Lowest Offices* of Service should not be
 refused, when the good of Others calls for
 them. 4. So that here, the *Condescension* of Our
 Lord in his whole *Life*, consider’d as a *Ministration*,
 or *Service*, to Mankind, is taken from the State
 and Office of *Slaves*. This is the *Point* which
 I have affirm’d, not of this *Passage* in particular;
 but of the *New Testament* in general. 5. I cannot
 say, as the Dean seems to do, that in these very
 Offices, and at the very moment of *Ministring* to O-
 thers, He acted AS CHIEF among them: But that
 He, who had a Right to the Services of Men; and

F 2

who

who was truly their *Lord* and *Master*; did in all those *Actions*, in which he *ministred* to Them, act willingly in such a manner, as that this Behaviour and Condescension of his might fitly be represented, in a *figure*, by an Allusion to the Behaviour of *Slaves*, obliged by their *Condition* to do out of *Duty* the lowest Offices to Others. 6. All this shews, (what the *Dean* designs, one would think, to overthrow,) that Our Lord was said *figuratively*, in his infinite Condescension, to take on him the *Form* of a *Slave*; and, in his *Ministring* to Others, to *personate* a *Slave*: both which Expressions suppose that He was *not* one really; as neither of them imply that He was not *truly* the *Lord* and *Master* of Those, whom He thus serv'd in his Life, and at his Death.

The *Dean* concludes his Observations upon the former of these Instances, thus. "What shall we say then? *That the Example of Christ is much more peculiarly fit for Slaves, than for Subjects?* God forbid!" Now,

1. As I never once mention'd this particular *Passage* of the *Gospel*, to prove or support my Proposition: so, it is plain, that the proving *this* Passage to be insufficient to support it, is nothing against *Me*; because I had never alledg'd it in my own Cause; and because, tho' *this Passage* should be demonstrated not to support my Assertion, yet, there may be *other Passages*, and *other Considerations*, sufficient to do it. But,

2. The *peculiar fitness* of this part of Our *Blessed Lord's* Behaviour, and of his own Account of Himself, to be proposed for the Comfort and Support of *Slaves* in the *Active* (I may say, *Passive*) part of the Ordinary and Constant Duty of their *Stations*, is very visible, notwithstanding what the *Dean* seems to think so plain against it. For, If the Great Lord of *Kings* and of *All Men*, was pleas'd to *personate* *Slaves*, in one of the most remarkable *Actions*

ons of his Life, and in one of the *lowest* of their Offices; and this, design'd by Himself to represent the whole Behaviour of his Life, for the Service of *Others*: If *He* himself, after advising his *Disciples* to do all good Offices, for All around them; and expressing this their Duty by using a Word which answer'd to the Greek *Δούλος*, or *Slave*; alledges his own *Example*, as the Example of One who came into this World, in order to do good to Others, and to stoop to the lowest Offices of *Ministration* to the good of Mankind: If the Great and Common Master of *Christians* thus behaves Himself, and thus speaks of *Himself*; certainly *Slaves*, or the *lowest* Part of Mankind, Those employ'd, by *Duty* or *Necessity*, in the lowest Offices of Humane Life, may receive more particular and peculiar Comfort and Support from hence, than *Subjects*, or Those who are not, by the ordinary and constant Nature of their Condition, as *Subjects*, so employ'd; nay, who are, very many of them, *Masters* of these *Slaves*, and receive their *Services*. It takes off from the Indignity, and from the Grievance of the lowest Condition, in the mind of a *Christian*, that his Great Lord and Master was pleas'd to represent *Himself*, upon some Occasions, and under some Views, as *personating* Those in that Condition: and cannot but make Him the more willing both to do and to suffer what always belongs to that *Low Condition*.

But what need more Words, when the *Dean*, tho' *here* He cries out, *God forbid!* yet in p. 13. has himself already declared that "It may be true that Our Blessed Lord's Example is more peculiarly fit to be proposed to the Low and distressed part of Mankind, than to the Fortunate, &c." Now, *Slaves*, I suppose, he will not deny to be the Low and distressed part of Mankind, in their ordinary Condition; and *Subjects* to be, comparatively, in *their* ordinary Condition, *Fortunate*.
There-

Therefore, "It may be true," according to *Himself*, that *Christ's* Example is more peculiarly fitted to the *One* than the *Other*. And therefore, I cannot contradict *Him* in *this* Passage, by joining with *Him* in *another*, and adding, *God forbid* that Any one should say, what *may be true*!

The *Dean* proceeds, p. 32. in this manner. "From these *Two Instances*, (and there are more such,) it appears that the Example of our Saviour's Humility is not urged in Scripture, upon the Representation of his Condition to that of a Slave, but upon account of his being Lord and Master, and Chief, tho' He ministred unto others." There is some Obscurity in this Passage, which I attribute to his *hast* in writing. In answer to it,

1. I shall compare it with my own *Proposition*; and see whether it concludes any thing against what I have said. My *Proposition* is "That the New Testament it self represents the Humiliation and low Estate of Christ in this World, by the Condition of *Slaves*, the lowest and most helpless part of *Mankind*." This is one *Reason* I give, why his *Example*, or *Condition*, is peculiarly fit to be proposed to *Slaves*. And the *Instances* now before Us, I have just now shewn to be capable naturally of such a *peculiar Accommodation*. The *Dean*, upon another Occasion, insists upon it, that I speak of this *peculiar fitness*, with respect to *Christ's Example*, as it is in itself; not affirming that it is expressly and actually applied in Scripture, as *peculiar* to Any one sort of Men, more than another. And now, in drawing up his *Conclusion* against this *Proposition* of mine, He does not say that Our Saviour's Humiliation and low Estate is *not* thus represented; but that the Example of his Humility is not *actually* thus urged in Scripture, in this *peculiar* manner: which does not at all contradict the *Proposition* before Him. For Our Blessed Lord's
Hu.

Humiliation may be represented, as I say it is, in *Scripture*; and yet the *Actual Application* of it, in particular *Passages* of *Scripture*, about which I never spake, may be founded upon his being *Lord*, and *Master*, and *Chief*. But,

2. Supposing it true, what the *Dean* here says of the *Passages* here mention'd; his *Conclusion*, and mine, may be very consistently maintain'd. For our *Lord's Example* is certainly, upon several Considerations, and in several *Respects*, peculiarly fit to be applied to several Sorts of *Persons*. Consider it as the most *Unparallel'd Condescension* for the Good of Others; and it is, in *this* view, peculiarly fit to be urged as an Argument for a much less Condescension in the *Great Men* of this World, for the good of those beneath Them. I have never had a Thought of contradicting this. But this does not all hinder, but that, in *another* Respect, it may be very peculiarly fit for the Support and Comfort of another and lower Sort of Men.

3. Much less does it contradict what I concluded from *this* amongst other Considerations. For my *Conclusion* related particularly to the *Silent Passive Submission* recommended to *Slaves*, whose ordinary and constant Condition unavoidably expos'd them to *Suffering*: which I distinguished from the *Duty of Subjects*, as such. And *Christ's Example* being expressly applied to the *One*, and not to the *Other*; I observ'd, that his *Example of Submission* was more peculiarly fit to be recommended to *Them*, than to *Subjects*, particularly consider'd as such. I spake of *Christ's Example*, consider'd as an Instance of *Silent and Patient Submission* to *Injuries*, and *Hardships*. Therefore, what I said upon *this*, cannot contradict what may be said upon his *Example*, consider'd merely as *Infinite Condescension*. I spake of a more peculiar fitness of it to the *Case of Slaves*, above that of *Civil Subjects*, with respect to *Suffer-*

ferings from *Superiours*. Therefore, This contradicts nothing, which may be said of it in quite *other* Respects; and *not* of *Civil Subjects*, consider'd as such, whom alone I was exempting, in this *Comparison*.

4. But even, as it is here represented by the *Dean*, supposing every Application of this *Example* in *Scripture* to be actually founded upon *Christ's* being our *Lord*, and *Master*, and *Chief*; as I have already shewn that the *Proposition* now before him is not at all contradicted by this: so, it will be as plain to *Himself*, that the *Doctrine* which I built upon this *Proposition*, is not at all contradicted by it, when He considers that he himself allows, "It may be true that *Christ's Example* is more peculiarly fit to be proposed to the Low Part of Mankind, &c." That is, in my Words, to *Slaves*. And if this may be true; then what the *Dean* here alledges, either does not contradict my *Doctrine*; or, if it does, it is not grounded upon *Scripture* and *Truth*.

5. As the *Dean* himself desires to understand the *Application* of *Christ's Example* here, methinks it may be made with a more peculiar Force, by *Slaves*, to their own *Case*, than by *Subjects*, in this manner. If *He*, who was our *Lord* and *Master*, voluntarily put *Himself*, in some Sense, into our *Case*, and suffered patiently, as if He had been under the *Command* of Men, and without *Privileges* himself; shall not This peculiarly encourage and engage *Us*, who are by the nature of our *Office* expos'd to Hardships, as the Effect of our *Condition*, and not of our *Condescension*, to suffer patiently what that *Condition* brings upon *Us*? I only mention this to shew that, even as the *Proposition* is here chang'd, it does not at all contradict what I have affirm'd.

3. After having done with the *Two Instances* now consider'd, the *Dean*, p. 33. proceeds to *St. Paul's Example*. And his Argument is twofold.

I. "St.

1. "St. Paul was a Freeman, and a Great Contender for Civil Rights. And yet He says of Himself that He had a great desire to *know the Fellowship of Christ's Sufferings*, Phil. iii. 10. But if it was (as his Lordship represents the Case) PART of Christ's Sufferings to personate a Slave, how could St. Paul pretend to desire the (*κοινωνία*) Fellowship of His Sufferings, who always behav'd Himself like so free a Subject?" The only difficulty in answering such Reasonings as these, is the difficulty of understanding what purpose They answer in the present Debate. But I will endeavour to say something to this; after having just observ'd that I have never thus express'd my self, that *Part of Christ's Sufferings* was to personate a Slave. And,

1. The *Argument* seems to me, with respect to the *Proposition* now alone before the Dean, to stand as if He had argued thus; "If the Voluntary Humiliation and Ministering Behaviour of Our Blessed Lord, who was so far from being a Slave, that He was the Lord of those to whom he Ministered; (as I ever acknowledg'd;) If his acting and suffering for the good of Others, be represented by a Figure taken from the Condition of *Slaves*: then, how could St. Paul, who was a Freeman in respect to his Civil Rights and Privileges among Men, be ambitious of being like his great Master, either in *Ministering* to the good of others; or in suffering patiently like his Lord; who, tho' Master of all, chose to suffer, as if He had been a Person without any Rights or Privileges to guard Him?" I think to State it, is to Answer it. Or thus, "If Our Blessed Lord, who was much more than a Freeman, even the Highest Lord and Master, did in any part of his Sufferings bear any Resemblance to the Condition of *Slaves*: How could St. Paul, who was in one Respect a Civil Subject, act or suffer in another Re-

G

spect.

spect like his Great *Master*?" And again ; " If *St. Paul*, when his *Civil Rights*, which he enjoy'd in common with All *Roman* Freemen, were invaded, contended earnestly for Them : How could He pretend to desire to suffer, in another Respect, as a *Christian*, and as a *Disciple* of his *Master*, any thing that might bear Resemblance to the *Sufferings* of *Slaves*?" I answer, Just as He, who is truly and really a *Freeman*, or even a *Master* of *Slaves*, may act, in some particular Case, even towards these very *Slaves*, as if He were not their *Lord*, but their *Servant*. And I add, that it may as well be ask'd, How *St. Paul*, who was a *Freeman* with respect to *Civil Rights*, could represent Himself and the other *Apostles* as the *Servants* of Men for Christ's Sake.

2. The other Argument from *St. Paul's* Example is this. " But if *St. Paul*, a freeborn Subject, did " partake in the *Sufferings* of Christ; then the *Sufferings* of Christ can yield his Lordship no Argument to say, that Christ was represented as a " Slave in Scripture." I must again remind the Reader what my *Proposition*, now before the *Dean*, is: Not, that the *Sufferings* of Christ are an Argument that Christ is represented as a Slave in Scripture; but that in Fact, His Humiliation and low Estate are describ'd by Allusions made to the low and helpless Condition of *Slaves*; which is indeed too much another *Point*, to be thus chang'd. And now,

1. To partake in *Christ's* *Sufferings*, signifying only to Suffer for the Sake of being a *Christian*; the Argument is this. If One, who is a *Civil Subject*, and a *Freeman*, may suffer, not as a *Civil Subject*, but as a *Christian*: then — What? Why then, the " Humiliation of Christ is not actually represented in Scripture by any Figures drawn from the " Condition of *Slaves*." This should have been the Consequence, if it had been oppos'd truly to My *Proposition*. But this would presently have been
seen

seen through ; as bearing no more relation to the Point, than if it had been argued thus, “ *A Civil Subject* suffered as a *Christian* ; and so partook in *Our Saviour’s* Sufferings. Therefore, *Our Saviour* did *not* wash his Disciples Feet. Therefore, our *Saviour* did not give up himself, in any such manner, as to resemble *One* without Rights and Privileges : And therefore, this *Resemblance* is no where represented and described in *Scripture*.

2. But, as the *Dean* has express’d the *Consequence*, it amounts to such an Argument as this. *St. Paul*, a *Free-born Subject*, did partake of *Our Saviour’s* Sufferings : that is, *suffer as a Christian*. Therefore, the Sufferings of *Christ*, merely as Sufferings, do not prove that He is represented as a *Slave*. But as I have never affirm’d this, I am no more concern’d in it, than *He* himself is. As to what I have affirm’d ; I hope it need not be prov’d to the meanest Capacity, that there may be *Circumstances* in the Behaviour and Sufferings of a *Freeman*, or even of the *Greatest Person* who can Suffer, which may be described and illustrated figuratively by the *Office*, the *Condition*, the Sufferings, of *Slaves* ; in order to make the deeper Impression, either about the great *Condescension* of his Actions, or the *Great Indignity* of his Sufferings.

3. We now come to the Sufferings of *Christ* himself, which the *Dean* begins to consider, in the middle of a *Paragraph*, p. 33. in this manner. “ And pray, which of *Christ’s* Sufferings prove any thing like *Slavery* To Be his Condition ? ” What must one say to such Questions, from a Person of so great Abilities ? when I have been as far from affirming *Slavery* to have been his Condition, as He himself has : when all that I have said upon this head, about the *Scripture-Representations* of *Our Lord’s* Humiliation, imply the very contrary ? But He goes on, and shews that *One* who was *not* a *Slave* might suffer in the same Manner that He did ;

“ that the very Form and Process of our Saviour's
 “ Tryal proves that he neither was, nor was taken
 “ to be a *Slave*: that so little was it suspected that
 “ He was a *Slave*, or that his *Business here* (i. e. at
 “ his Tryal) was to represent a *Slave*, that the
 “ Great Accusation against Him was that he pre-
 “ tended to be a *King*,” &c.—“ All this, (adds
 the *Dean*) “ is doubtless very like the Tryal of a
 “ *Slave*!” Now, without staying to ask, what all
 this is design'd for, or against; I answer, since I
 must answer,

1. That I never could once imagine in my Heart,
 much less affirm in Words, that One not a *Slave*
 might not suffer in the same manner with our *Bles-*
sed Lord; because I affirm'd Him himself, who thus
 suffer'd, Not to have been a *Slave*: that I never
 once thought that *He* either was a *Slave*, or was
 taken for a *Slave*; and therefore, could never argue,
 from his Tryal, or from any thing else, a *Matter*
 which I never admitted into my Thoughts: that I
 never affirm'd or imagin'd that Christ's *Business* at
 his Tryal was to represent a *Slave*; or that he did
 not pretend to be a *King*; or, which is all along in
 this place laid upon Me, that *Every Part* of his Be-
 haviour bore resemblance in every respect to the
Condition of a *Slave*: And lastly, That I never once
 said, or imagin'd, that his Tryal was *All very like*
the Tryal of a Slave. It is a hard Case to be thus
 represented, in a *Book* offer'd to the World as a
Vindication of Our *Blessed Lord's Condition* and *Ex-*
ample, from *My Imputations*; when I have never
 once, I say never once, thus spoken either of his *Con-*
dition, or his *Example*. But,

2. The Proposition now before the *Dean*, against
 which He is professedly arguing, is this, p. 29.
 “ That the *New Testament* REPRESENTS the
 “ Humiliation, and low Estate of *Christ*, in this
 “ World, by the Condition of *Slaves*, the lowest
 “ and

“ and most helpless Part of Mankind.” Now let any *Common Reader* compare with *this*, what the *Dean* here alledges ; and then judge. For certainly, Our Blessed Lord’s *Condition* or *Behaviour*, in some respects, may be thus represented ; and yet this *Representation* be far from being design’d to extend to it in *all* Respects. It cannot be thus *figuratively* represented, without the constant Supposition of its not being *really* so. A *Freeman* may in many *Actions* condescend to *personate* a *Slave* : which takes nothing at all from his *Freedom*. A *Freeman* may suffer so, as to resemble in some *Circumstances* the suffering of a *Slave* : as All *Freemen*, who suffer’d for *Sedition* in our Lord’s time, suffer’d the *Punishment* of *Slaves*, for the greater Indignity and Terror. A *Person* not only professing himself, but being really, a *King* by Right, in *One* Respect, may in his *low* Estate, (whether voluntary or not,) suffer and do many things, not as a *King*, but as if he was devested of All Royal Rights, and upon the level with the meanest of his *People*. In short, Our Saviour neither *was*, nor *was taken to be*, really a *Slave* ; nor was his *Trial* any proof of his being so : nor was any thing like this ever said, or so much as thought, by *Me*, whatsoever the *Dean* has judg’d proper to lay upon me. But, notwithstanding this, *Christ’s Humiliation* may be, and is, REPRESENTED in *Scripture*, by the *Condition* of *Slaves*, [not consider’d as *bought* and *sold* in the Market, but as] the LOWEST and most HELPLESS Part of Mankind ; and therefore, as such, in a *Condition* which might justly afford the strongest figures of Speech to illustrate the greatest Condescension, the lowest Humiliation, the most silent Suffering, of *Our Lord* : who tho’ *high* and *powerful*, and vested with the most *Divine* Rights, yet chose to act, in many Instances, the Part of a *Servant* ministring to others, and of one devested of *Rights* and *Privileges*.

The

The *Dean* goes on to shew “ that Our Blessed Lord’s Family was free ; that He lived with his Parents, as other Children did ; that no one suspected Him to BE a Slave, or upbraided Him, as one:” and the like. All which, I confess, when I read it, makes me wonder, and stop, in order to consider what part I have in it. Our *Blessed Lord* was not only of a *Free Family*, but of the *Royal Family*. He never was suspected to be a *Slave*, because he could not be suspected to be one. But notwithstanding all this, His *Condition*, and his *Behaviour*, in many Respects, even to *Those* whose Lord and King he was, may be in *Scripture* REPRESENTED, and illustrated, by the *Condition* of the *lowest* and most *helpless* Part of Mankind : which was the Point now before the *Dean* to disprove ; but which he has put quite out of sight.

Again, “ Our Saviour Himself, speaking of his lowest Estate, says, *The Son of Man hath not where to lay his Head.*” Now, “ there is a great difference (says the *Dean*) between having no Money,” (which by the way this Text speaks nothing of) “ and being sold for Money in the Market : Besides, “ Slaves were not to seek where to lay their Heads, “ They were fix’d to the Houses of their Masters,” &c. Well, what follows from hence ? Nothing but that *Our Saviour* was not a Slave ; or was not always represented as a Slave ; or that He was, in this one Circumstance, even lower and more unhappy than a Slave. But if I ask, What is this to the Proposition now before the *Dean* ? or to any one thing said by me upon this Subject ? I fear, I shall have no Answer. For is it not too plain almost to bear repeating, That tho’ *Our Saviour* was not a Slave ; Tho’ he did not resemble a Slave, in the Circumstance of being bought and sold in a Market ; neither of which has ever been contradicted by me : yet, his *Humiliation* may be illustrated by a

Figure taken from the *Condition of Slaves*, in other respects? And that, *Tho' he had not where to lay his Head*, [which itself is only a *figurative Expression*] yet, it may be true that the *Scripture* may represent some particular *Circumstances* relating to his *Humiliation* and *Behaviour*, by *Figures* taken from some *Circumstances* in the *Condition of Slaves*? But when I can meet with no *Objections* against the *Proposition* now before the *Dean*, but what are entirely founded upon the *Supposition* of my having maintain'd what I never admitted into my *Thoughts*: When this is the *Case*; and long and many *Citations* are produced to this purpose; I may justly think that what I have *not* said, is judg'd to be much more easy to confute, than what I *have* said; and that it is a much less difficult task for an *Adversary* to make me *Speak* what *He wishes* I had spoken, than to disprove what I have *really* spoken.

When I see this Method in Writers of *Controversy*, it puts me in mind of a *Preacher* I once heard, who, having Occasion to mention that Text of *St. Peter*, Ch 1. v. 4. *To an Inheritance incorruptible — reserv'd in Heaven for you*, I remember, repeated it; and then added, with great Earnestness, Or, as I *wish* it had been read, *reserv'd in Heaven, within you*. After which *Wish*, he took it for granted it was read so; and built his following Arguments upon it. I confess, I can give no better account of the present Proceeding, than this. One is apt sometimes to *wish* that an *Adversary* had said what he never said; and to *wish* this so long, till one may come to imagine *He has* really said it; and so, to go on and argue against him, upon that *Imagination*, which was originally only a *Wish* of our own.

Before I leave this part of the *Argument*, in which my *Doctrine* has been thus mistaken, and thus set forth; I will take the Liberty to propose one thing to the *Dean*, which perhaps may convince him, as
much

much as any Argument I can make use of, that the whole frame of his *Reasonings* and *Quotations* here, upon the present Subject, are entirely Foreign to the Purpose. The *Considerations*, which some-time ago He did me the honour to offer to me, are concluded with a very remarkable *Sting*; in which a very worthy, learned, and judicious Writer, is represented, as *put* by me to the *Employment* of Writing; as a *Second* chosen by me; and the *Lowness* of my Choice, and the *Contempt* to be pour'd upon my *Second*, is illustrated by the *Low* and *Contemptuous* Condition of a *Roman SLAVE*, attending the *Consul* in his *Triumph*; the Word *SERVUS* being put in *Capital Letters*, for fear it should not be thought to belong to Him. Suppose now that a *Book* should be written to prove that this Person was *never bought in the Market*; nor *taken Captive* in a just War: That he was a *Freeborn Subject*; of a *Free*, and very good *Family*: That he *lived with his Parents as other Children do*; that he never was *taken to be a Slave* by Those who knew him; that he had done many *Actions* which could not be the *Actions* of a *Slave*; that what he did for my Honour and Service was *Voluntary*, and that he was *sui juris*, independent, whilst he perform'd it: and the like. I appeal to the *Dean*, whether he would not think it very unjust to be thus treated, as if he had call'd Him a *SLAVE* properly speaking; or affirm'd his Condition *TO BE* the Real Condition of a *Slave*; or Him to have been actually *bought in the Market*; or that in this part of his Behaviour he resembled a *Slave* consider'd as one *bought in the Market*: And whether He would not judge it a sufficient Answer, to say, that he only made an *Allusion* to a *Roman Slave*, in one particular Circumstance; that he only *REPRESENTED*, or described, the *Low* and *Contemptuous* Condition he esteem'd that Gentleman to be in, by the Condition of a *Slave* attending a *Consul*; that

that this is an allow'd *Figure of Speech*, to represent a *Person* who is NOT a *Slave*, as resembling one in such or such Particulars: and that therefore, nothing can be more foreign to the purpose, than to write elaborately against *This*, as if it implied or affirm'd *Him* really to be what He is only said to PERSONATE in one respect. But to proceed.

After these *Proofs* that our Blessed Lord neither was, nor was taken to be, really a *Slave*; the Dean goes on thus. "Upon the whole; I cannot imagine upon what Passages his Lordship builds, when He says that our Lord is pleased frequently to describe his own low Estate, by the Condition of Slaves; or when He says, *The New Testament* it self represents — the Low Estate of Christ — by the Condition of Slaves." I confess, I thought these Propositions so plain, that I needed not to cite particular Passages. But what I have said, I will now found upon the Two Passages, with which He himself has just now furnished Me. St. John xiii. v. 4. *Matth. xx. 28.* In the former, our Blessed Lord is declared by the Dean himself, to perform a *Servile Work*, upon his own *Servants* and *Disciples*; p. 30. that is, a Work which properly belong'd to *Slaves*. And certainly, nothing could give us a more lively Description or Representation of that Humiliation and Infinite Condescension; or of that LOW ESTATE into which He put himself, for the Good and Service of Others; than this Action of his, in which He, who was above All, personated the Meanest Servant, to shew his Condescension for the Good of others. In the latter of these Passages, our Lord himself describes the very End of his Coming, to be to MINISTER to others, which answers to the Office of a Servant, [Δῖνα] mention'd in the Verse before, as the Dean not only allows, but contends from St. Mark, p. 45. the signification of which Word Δῖνα I shall consider,

sider, when I come to the several *Passages* in which He affirms, it does not signify a SLAVE.

In the mean while, I may here observe that the *Illustration*, as I understand it, is certainly very well fitted to the purpose: it being plain, that the LowNESS of his *Estate*, chosen for the good of others; His *Humiliation* and *Condescension*, in every thing truly expedient for Them; could not be better represented, in humane Words, than by *Figures* taken from, and *Allusions* made to, the Condition of *Slaves*, constantly employ'd in the lowest Offices of *Service* to others. And if these two *Passages*, produced by the *Dean* against Me, do Themselves thus describe our Lord's Condition; I may undertake, I believe, to produce some more, whenever they shall be judg'd necessary. The *Passage*, upon which peculiarly, I confess, I had my Eye, [*Phil. ii. 5.*] I shall consider, when I come to it, in the *Dean's* following Pages: and shew that it fully answers what I laid upon it. But I cannot now proceed, without taking Notice in what manner the *Dean* has thought fit to conclude this part of the *Argument*.

1. He represents me, as under the Word *Accuser*, which I thought as soft a Word as I could chuse, intending to call Him by the Blackest Name, because [*Διδόλ*] the Greek Word for *Devil*, happens to signify an *Accuser*: a *Method* of Writing, wholly unknown to me; and a Design which My Thoughts abhor. If every Time there is mention made of a Person *accusing* another, or of the *Accuser* in a particular Controversy, the Word *Διδόλ* may be put in its place; I believe this will bear equally hard upon every *Writer*. For my self; I can only say that I never dreamt it was possible for any one so to interpret an *innocent* Word, till I saw the *Dean's* Book. And then I presently wonder'd how a *Learned Person* could so readily throw this *Imputation* upon Me, founded upon the peculiar Signification

tion of a *Greek Word*, at the same time that He is contending that the *Word Servant*, tho' translated from the *Greek Word* δούλος, and answering to it, yet does not signify a *Slave*, in the several Passages of the *New Testament* it self, quoted by Him. This is not all. For,

2. He makes a *Digression*, to entertain his *Reader* with my *Disrespect* to the *Holy Scriptures*. And after having observ'd "how frankly I throw the *Imputation* from *My self* to the *New Testament* ;" He tells his *Reader*, "This is his *Lordship's* common Practice. I will, says He, give one famous Instance : " which He does by quoting, out of the *Reply to the Report*, p. 155. these following Words of mine. " *I thought it my greatest Defense to shelter what I had said under the Name of our Common Lord and Master : and rather than express My Reason, in my own Words, I chose to make use of his Authority, and to say that To apply worldly Motives in the Cases mention'd, is to act contrary to the Interests of True Religion, as it is plainly opposite to the Maxims upon which Christ founded his Kingdom.*" Nor do I much wonder that He, who before left the *Answer to the Report*, to introduce A *By-Controversy* of quite another sort, should now go back again to that *Answer to the Report*, for a little *Personal Reproach*, to divert the *Reader* even from this *Present New By-Controversy* of his own raising. And thus, We are to be entertain'd with a *By-Controversy* within a *By-Controversy* ; and may be so for ever, unless All my Writings are free from *Humane Infirmities* ; or my *Adversaries* can come to think I have some Title to their *Candour*.

The *Dean*, after citing my Words, asks, with some Vehemence, "Whose are these Words, I beseech you ?" To which He answers, "His Lordship *Seems to me to say*, that the Words are not

“ *His*, and I assure the Reader, They are not the
 “ *Words of Scripture*: — Neither have They the
 “ *Authority of Scripture*, but stand merely upon his
 “ *Lordship's Consequential Reasonings.*” The Reader
 will please to observe, that I was here answering to
 an *Objection* against the *Sentence* in my *Sermon* here
 repeated. And this matter, thus drawn in for *per-*
sonal Entertainment, stands thus.

1. Supposing I had spoke only of not using *My*
own Words, the very *Design* of the *Sentence* would
 have shown, that I could mean nothing but *My own*
Words, consider'd as free from all *Appeal* to the
Authority of Another. 2. As this is plain from my
Appeal to the *Authority of Christ* immediately: So
 is it as plain, that I never once either say, or in-
 timate, that what I propose here, is in the very
Words of Christ; or that the *Words*, in which I ap-
 peal to his *Authority*, are not *My own Words*. Nay,
 how I could appeal to *His Authority*, in any *Words*
 but *My own*, I cannot imagine. But, 3. Whoever
 reads the *Sentence* will see, that I do not either affirm
 or intimate, that I *did not Use My own Words*; but
 that “ rather than express my *Reason* in my own
 “ *Words*,” I chose, &c. That is, Rather than argue
 from any *Reason*, separate from *Authority*, I chose,
 in that *Passage*, to appeal to the *Authority of Christ*,
 and to those *Maxims* of his *Kingdom*, laid down by
 Himself; of which I had before, in the same *Ser-*
mon, given an *Account*. And how great a *Conde-*
scension is it in the *Dean*, rather to be willing to
 look like a *Person* not very capable of seeing the
 meaning of a plain *Sentence*, when He has *Abi-*
lities for much greater and more important *Mat-*
ters; than to omit any *Opportunity* of represent-
 ing *Me*, in a very bad *Light*, to the *World*? What
 I say therefore, is, Not that the *Words* of this *Sen-*
tence are *Not mine*; but that, at that time when I
 was speaking particularly of *Christ's Kingdom*, I
 chose,

chose, rather than to argue from *Reason*; rather than to give *My own Reasons* alone, in my own Words, to appeal to *Christ's Declarations*. 4. As the *Dean* assures his *Reader*, that the very Words in this Sentence are *not* the Words of *Scripture*, which I never said they were; we have no difference in this. 5. But when He adds, that They have not the *Authority of Scripture*, but stand only upon my *Consequential Arguings*; I must beg leave to observe, that neither He himself, nor any other *Writer* in the *World*, ever has the *Authority of Scripture*, but by what He may, if He pleases, call *Consequential Arguings*; that is, by supposing and fixing the *Sense of Scripture* to be such, or such. He rightly observes, p. 39. upon another Occasion, that "to quote *Scripture* by the mere *Sound of Words*, is to judge *of Scripture* by the *Ear*, and not by the *Understanding*." And consequently, I presume, It can be no *Crime* in a Person to suppose Himself to have the *Authority of Scripture* on his side, when He supposes the *True Sense and Meaning* of it to be with Him. If any one has been mistaken in *this*; it has never been accounted his *Crime*. Nor is it one in *Me*, any more than it is in the *Dean*, to contend so earnestly through this whole *Book*, that He has the *Authority of Scripture* on *his* side, against *Me*, in this particular Controversy: which He is often forc'd to do, by what He calls *Consequential Reasonings*. 6. Lastly, Whether it can be said, (I mean *prov'd*.) that I have not the *Authority of Christ* in what I alledg'd; I leave to *Others* to judge, who read it in the *Sermon* it self, as it is built upon what goes *before*. Nay, tho' this Sentence consists not of the *Words of our Saviour*; yet there are added at the *End* of it these Words, "*Who chose the Motives which are not of this World, to support a Kingdom which is not of this World.*" And no *Christian*, who has read the *New Testament*, will deny that *This*, which is the Founda-

Foundation of what I say, has the *Authority* of *Scripture* on its side : it being only in *other Words* what is in almost every Page of the *New Testament*.

The *Dean* concludes this *Paragraph* with “ leaving
“ *Me* to account for *this Passage* ; and the *Reader* to
“ consider in what manner I use the *Name* of
“ *our Lord and Master for a Shelter*.” I have now
accounted for *this Passage*. And the *Reader* cannot but
see that I have used the *Name* of *our Lord and Master*,
in no other manner than *that*, in which All *Christian*
Writers, who have ever appeal’d to his Sayings and
his Declarations, have done ; in that *same* manner,
in which the *Dean* himself has used it, as well as
All others of my *Adversaries*, whenever They have
appealed to Any of *His Words*, and interpreted them
in a Sense contrary to mine.

And here, that I may not again interrupt the
Argument by and by, I chuse to take notice of the
Dean’s Repeating this *Accusation*, with much greater
Aggravations, in p. 47. where He says, “ The
“ *Reader* must be surpriz’d to hear his Lordship de-
“ claring, that to blame this Doctrine of his, [*viz.*
“ about *Christ’s Example*] is to accuse the *New*
“ *Testament*, p. 14. §. 2. To Calumniate the *Apostles*,
“ §. 2. To reproach *St. Paul*, §. 3. Nay, to contra-
“ dict *Christ himself*. I wish (says the *Dean*) his
“ Lordship had used these great Names with more
“ respect. But this is His Method of appealing
“ to *Scripture*: And thus it is, that *All* his Do-
“ctrines are *Scripture Doctrines*, and *All* his *Ad-*
“versaries Opposers of *Christ* and his *Apostles*.”

One cannot, I believe, easily think of Another
Instance of a Man of Learning and Abilities, deal-
ing out his Imputations in a manner so unguarded ;
so very unkind to his *Adversary*, and yet so much
more unkind to *Himself*. Had He remembered that
it was *He himself*, who had grossly accus’d *Me*, in
the Face of the *World*, without entring into the

Argu-

Argument ; not of mistaking in My Judgment about a *Point* of *Scripture*, but of offering personal Indignity to our Blessed Lord ; and *this*, not through an innocent Misunderstanding of some Expressions of the *New Testament*, but for no other Reason in the *World*, but because His Great Example stood in the way of my Argument : Had He consider'd this, He would not have recall'd to his *Reader's* Mind, What it was that gave Me occasion to speak as I did. This was the Case. I was thus calumniated, not by consequential Arguings, but by a gross Accusation, for representing Our Saviour's Example as I did, in one particular Case. In answer to this, I took a Review of the Matter ; and endeavour'd to shew, that the *Doctrine* was founded upon *Scripture* : and consequently, that the same Representation of our Lord's Example being in the *New Testament*, the Imputation must fall upon *That* ; &c. All this, as I have said, being in answer to a very heavy Accusation, which was the *Point* then before Me ; It must appear very unaccountable that *He*, who flatly accus'd Me of offering an Indignity to our Blessed Saviour, should go on to accuse Me only for endeavouring to shew, in my own Defense, that the *Doctrine*, which He esteems such an Indignity, is in the *New Testament* ; and therefore, (what I cannot help, because it is a Consequence, which is neither in his Power, nor mine, either to make, or unmake,) that the same Imputation must fall, in the *Event*, upon the *New Testament* it self : Not that *He* design'd or intended it ; not that *He* was such an One as *He* has described Me to be ; one who would not scruple to cast a Reproach upon the *Scripture*, merely because it stood in his Way ; (all which I have avoided saying of Him and Others ;) but that, in the Nature of Things, or in the *Event*, it must fall there.

1. *This, I confess, is my Method of appealing to Scripture: and, I suppose, the Dean knows no better a Method, than, when a Man is cruelly accus'd of offering Indignity to our Blessed Saviour, to endeavour to shew that what is so severely blam'd, He took from the New Testament it self.*

2. Besides that this was *Self-Defense* against an *Attack*; I have the *Dean's Example* now before Me. For what is his whole Book, but an Endeavour to shew that I have oppos'd the Tenour of the *New Testament*; contradicted the *Apostles*, and our Lord himself; and that his own *Doctrine* is the *Doctrine of Christ*. As in his *Considerations*, p. 71. even before attempting to give Me one *Reason* against what I had said of *Religion* as a *Civil Test*, He calls My *Doctrine*, "A
" Censure upon the common Sense and Reason of
" Mankind, upon all Times and all Nations of the
" World—and presently brings into the Cause, both
" *Natural and Revealed Religion*," as contradicted by me. Thus, might I say, in the *Dean's Way*, *All his Doctrines* are the *Doctrines of Reason*, and *Scripture*: and *All his Adversaries Opposers of Reason and Revelation*; of the *Old Testament* and the *New*; of *Noah* and his *Instructions*; of *Christ* and his *Apostles*. But,

3. As to *Doctrines*; I hope, it is no Matter of *Shame*, but of *Glory*, to a *Christian* and a *Clergyman*, to espouse and publish no *Doctrines* relating to *Christ* and *Christianity*, but what He esteems, and endeavours to prove, to be *Scripture-Doctrines*. I have no *Others*, I profess: nor ever desire to have any *Others*. And I will ever endeavour to represent Them to the World, as such, without the fear of being reproach'd as having No *Doctrines* but *Scripture-Doctrines*. Nor do I doubt at all of having the *Concurrence* of the *Dean's Example*, according to Custom, in what He here so severely ridicules in Me. *All his Doctrines* about *Christianity*, are, I presume, in his own Esteem,

Scripture

Scripture-Doctrines ; nor would He be suppos'd to represent or speak of them, as *Other* than *Scripture-Doctrines*. He knows very well that *Christians* have *No Rule* but *Scripture* to go by : and He knows it to be the *Glory* of a *Christian* to appeal to *That Rule* in all Cases. He has carried this so far, in the very *Book* before Us, in which I am thus treated, that He has fill'd it with many and large *Quotations*; and thought it fully sufficient to justify his *Personal Severity* to Me, if He can prove that the contrary *Doctrine* to mine is a *Scripture-Doctrine*.

4. As to my *Adversaries* ; I never did once, upon the highest Provocation, represent (I will not say ALL, but) so much as any *One* of them as an "*Opposer of Christ*" and his *Apostles*," in a blame-worthy Sense. I think indeed my own *Doctrines*, relating to *Christ*, to be *Scripture-Doctrines* ; or else, I should be Self-condemn'd in publishing them: And I have endeavour'd to shew, that the *Doctrines* contrary to them are not *Scripture-Doctrines*. But this cannot be the *Dean's* Intention in this Sting: because This is *His own* Case, and the Case of every *Christian Writer* in the World. For whoever esteems *His own Doctrine* to be the *Scripture-Doctrine*, must esteem Those who oppose it, to oppose a *Scripture-Doctrine* ; the *Doctrine of Christ* and his *Apostles*. This was never accounted, in an Unchristian Sense, to represent an *Adversary*, as an *Opposer of Christ* and his *Apostles*. And as for any thing farther, I have never express'd a Thought, as if I did not imagine Every one of My *Adversaries* concern'd for Their own *Doctrines*, under the Notion of their being the *Doctrines of Christ*; and equally engag'd in the Search after *Truth*, with My self. As to the *Dean* himself, I have indeed, when I have been grossly represented as offering *Indignity* to Our *Saviour*, and not merely as mistaking his *Doctrine* ; I have, I say, upon this Occasion, and in answer to this, endeavour'd to shew, not

I

that

that this *Accusation* was design'd against any *Doctrine* of *Scripture*; but that, in Consequence and Event, it must fall upon it. But I must beg Leave in particular to put *Him* in mind, that I have never tax'd Any *Adversary* with considering the State of a *Fairy World*, rather than consulting the *Sacred History*; that I have never pointed out any *One* of them, in a remarkable shocking Manner, as an *Opposer* of *Christ*, by offering Indignity to *Him*, for a poor low End of his own; and that, how unkindly soever the *Dean* would here set forth My *Manner* of using Our *Lord's* great Name, as well as the *Holy Scripture* itself; I say, that in all the *Accusations* and *Charges*, under which I have been so unhappy as to lie, I never yet made so free with that *sacred Name*, as to make use of it to give *Popularity* to a *Title-Page*, in a *Personal Controversy*; nor ever, by Way of *Vindication* of My self from a particular *Charge*, allarm'd the World with "A *Vindication of Our Blessed Saviour*." Indeed, if I had ended one *Book* with a certain shocking *Imputation*; and begun Another in such a manner; I should, upon the Review, have fear'd that the *Title* of the latter would have been universally judg'd to be only a *Continuation* of the *Calumny* in the *Conclusion* of the *Former*. It is a sensible Grief to Me, to find it necessary, in my own *Vindication*, to put the *Dean* in mind, upon Whom such *Reproaches* fly back again: But since it is necessary, I must observe, that *He* who is so unkind as to go on to represent Me in so cruel a Manner, is yet so *Humane*, as to shew Me, in Himself and his own *Example*, the *Best Excuse* I can ever hope to make to *Him*, (I had almost said) in every single Instance of what He would willingly fix upon me. To proceed,

IV. The *Dean* goes on, p. 37. to My *Fourth* and *Last Reason*: which is this. "That our Lord voluntarily put himself into that low, oppress'd, helpless, Condition of a *Servant*; and never ac-
counted

" counted it his Infamy, but his *great Glory*, to be
 " so spoken of. *St. Paul* particularly makes it his
 " great Reward." The Condition of a *Servant* here
 mention'd, is that *Low Estate*, that *Humiliation*, for
 the Good and Service of *Others*, expressly mention'd
 by Me, as represented in *Scripture* by Allusions to
 the State of *Slaves*: Not the *Real Condition* of a
Servant in all respects, the least Hint of which has
 never drop'd from my Pen; but the *Form* of a *Ser-*
vant, as the *Phrase* in *St. Paul* is, to which I parti-
 cularly here appeal.

The *Dean* is very willing here to agree with Me
 in this, that Our Lord's *Condescension*, and *Suffering*,
 were voluntary. And " this, says He, might have
 " shewn his *Lordship*, that our *Saviour's* Sufferings
 " were not like the Sufferings of a *Slave*, who suf-
 " fers by the *Force* and *Power* of *Others*." This, I
 confess, is beyond my Capacity to account for,
 that, when I myself pointed out, and declared, this
 peculiar *Difference* between the *suffering* of our *Lord*,
 and that of *Slaves*, this should be brought back to Me
 as an *Argument*, for what I not only never contradict-
 ed, but expressly contended for. I Answer there-
 fore, to all this, that My *Proposition* here to be op-
 pos'd by the *Dean* is, not, " That Our *Saviour's*
 " Sufferings or *Humiliation* either were truly, or in
 " all Particulars resembled, those of a *Slave*:" but,
 " That Our Lord was pleas'd *Voluntarily* to put
 " himself into such a Condition of *Ministring* to
 " Others, and of *Suffering*, as might be justly, and
 " was actually, described and represented by Words
 " taken from the *Condition* of Those, who involun-
 " tarily and by *Force* undergo what He under-
 " went by *Choice*: Not that our Lord was not
 " *sui juris*, in his own Power; or that He was
 " really *Helpless*, or divested of Rights and Privile-
 " ges; but that, being and remaining *sui juris*, and
 " having *Power* as well as *Right* on his side, He

acted, in many Cases, as one of the *Lowest* of *Servants*; and in many particulars of his *Circumstances* is described as resembling the most helpless and low Persons; such as are without Assistance, and without the *Common Privileges* of *Civil Subjects*. And for *this*, as He says truly, *p. 38*. I shall appeal to *Phil. ii. 7*. [Christ] *took upon him the Form of a Servant, &c.*

The *Dean* observes here that, “by putting *Slave* “instead of *Servant* into that Text, I lead the Reader “to think that *St. Paul* represents our Saviour as “taking on Him the Form of a Slave, *i. e.* [adds “the *Dean*] of one who is not *sui juris*, but is “bought and sold in the Market for the Service of “a private Master.” And against *This*, He allows himself time to argue seriously. Now in *this*, He is exceedingly mistaken. For, besides that I have already often observ’d that I never in this Controversy have annex’d those two *last Ideas* to the Word *Slave*; and have expressly declared long ago that our Lord had no *Private Master*; I must add, that what I desire to lead the *Reader* to, is this, “That the Infinite Condescension of Our Blessed Lord in becoming Man, for the Service of Mankind, is represented by an Allusion to the very lowest Estate of humane Life, by his voluntarily *taking upon Him the Form of a Slave*; and that the vast distance between his Glorious Divine Estate, and the Estate into which He voluntarily put himself, is illustrated by this *Figurative Representation*; that his acting and suffering for the Good and Service of Mankind, as well as several particular Circumstances in his Life and Death, may justly be represented, and are in fact represented, by an *Allusion* to the State of Slaves; and the like. If the *Dean* had confined himself to My Real Notion, a great deal of Time and Trouble had been spared. But I must consider his *Observations* as they lie, *p. 39*.

1. " The Apostle was not speaking to *Slaves* peculiarly, and therefore, had no Occasion to represent Christ under the Form of a Slave, properly so called," &c. I answer, the *Apostle* was speaking to *Christians*; and pressing upon them *Humility* and *Condescension*, for the mutual Service of one another; and nothing could be more proper than to point out to them the *Humiliation* of *Christ* for the Service and Good of *Others*, by an *Allusion* to the lowest *State* of Service in *Humane* Life.

2. In giving an Account of the Apostle's design in the beginning of this Chapter, the *Dean* mentions indeed the *third* Verse, *Let nothing be done thro' strife and vain glory*, &c. but then he goes to v. 5, as if there was nothing of importance between them. Whereas, in v. 4. the *design* of urging the *Example* of *Christ* is plainly express'd. *Look not every Man on his own Things, but every Man also on the things of Others*: i. e. Be ready to humble your selves, and to condescend (not to the Service of God, in a peculiar Sense, which is no *Condescension*, but) to the mutual Service of one another. Then follows immediately, after advising them to *serve one another*, *Let this mind be in you, which was in Christ Jesus*. This, I think, shews plainly that the *Condescension* of our Lord is here spoken of, as his *Infinite Condescension* in serving the true Interest of *Men*, his *Inferiors*; and not in becoming the *Servant* of God his Father, in any Sense of *serving God* peculiarly distinguish'd from the Service of *Men* for their Good.

3. The *Dean* himself, even whilst he leaves out v. 4. cannot help unwarily laying it down, p. 40. that the Apostle shews, in what he here says of *Christ*, " that He was content to lay aside his Glory, that he might do good to Others: which is the *Condescension* I am speaking of.

4. Let us now consider what the *Dean* represents the *Apostle* as saying of *Christ*.

1. His

1. His first Reasoning is this, as well as I can understand it, p. 40. "*Who being in the Form of God—*" *emptied himself*, or voluntarily laid aside that *divine Form of Glory, Power, and Majesty*, and *took upon himself (willingly) the Form of a Servant*. The *Form of a Servant* (says He) is here *opposed*, (not to the State of a *Civil Subject* or *Freeman*, but) to the *Form of God*. And he desires me to consider, whether the *Form of God* be *so little, so inconsiderable* a thing, that the *Form of a Servant*, when opposed to it, must needs signify the *Form of a Slave properly so called*." I answer, 1. The Thing precisely here opposed to the *Form of God*, is our Lord's becoming *Man*, with the Circumstance added to it of the low and humble Estate in which He chose to appear for the Service of Mankind. This *Condescension* for the good of Men, was so vast, that it is figuratively describ'd by taking on him the *Form of a Servant*. The very Reason, why the *Illustration*, or Figure of Speech, is taken from the *lowest Office, or Service*, in humane Life; from the State of *Slaves*; is because the *Form of God*, is *NOT* a little, or an *Inconsiderable* thing. For I assure the Dean, (since he thinks fit to put such Questions to Me,) that it is *Because* I think the *Form of God* infinitely removed from *little or inconsiderable*, that I am confirm'd in interpreting the *Form of a Servant*, in the *lowest* Sense possible: the *Greater*, the more *Considerable*, the more *Exalted*, the *Form of God* is, rendring it still the more proper to illustrate the *vast distance* of the Condition of *Man* from it, and the infinite *Condescension* of *Him* who became *Man*, and appeared in a low Condition for the Service of Men, by the very *lowest* Word that could be borrow'd from *Humane Life*. If it had been said, *Who being in the Form of God took upon him the Form of a King*: Tho' the *Form of the Greatest Earthly Prince* is in it self unconceivably

bly distant from the *Form* of God; yet, considering that *We* are acquainted with that *Station*, as a *Station* of Glory and Power, and see so many degrees of Humane Life below it, This could not have been so proper in this place: Nor indeed could any *Figures* of Speech so effectually illustrate the *Condescension* of our Saviour, as those taken from the State of Persons in the *lowest* Offices of Humane Life. After this *Condescension* of our *Blessed Lord's* becoming Man, and appearing in the *low Form* of one ministering to others throughout his *Life*, is thus illustrated by his *being in the Form of God*, and condescending to take on him the *Form of a Servant*; the *Apostle* goes on to express his farther *Humiliation* at his *Death*; for which purpose he begins with considering him as a *Man* only. [καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὑπαίθετος ὡς ἄνθρωπος,] And being found in *Fashion as a Man*, — Where St. Paul seems to avoid using the very Expression of the *Form* of a *Servant* or *Slave*, (which he had just now used,) because the Word *Slave* here could not have serv'd to illustrate this *Second Instance* of *Condescension*. For the submitting to a *servile Death*, would not have sounded as a *Great Condescension* in One, consider'd expressly as having put on the *Form of a Slave*. But the *Apostle's* meaning in this *latter Instance* seems to be this, that, if we consider our Lord, after his *first Condescension*, as having already humbled himself so far as to become *Man* for the good of others; He humbled himself still farther for the good of Mankind, and being now found in *Fashion as a Man*, submitted as far as *Death* itself; and this, a *servile sort of Death*, even the *Death of the Cross*. By the mention of this Particular, He still takes care to preserve the same *Idea*, in this *latter Instance* likewise, of the *Lowness* of Our Lord's *Condescension* at his *Death*, for the good of Others. So that, in these Words, it appears to me at present, first, That our Lord's *Condescension*, consider'd as being in the *Form*

Form of God, and becoming Man, and appearing in a Low and Ministring Condition amongst Men, is very properly described by the *Form* of a *Servant*, or *Slave*, which is the *lowest Estate* of *Ministration* in *Humane Life*; and therefore, the fittest *Illustration* possible of the *vast Distance* between the *State* in which He was, and the *State* to which He *con- descended* for the *Service* of Men: And *secondly*, That his farther *Humiliation*, consider'd now only as *being found in fashion as a Man*, is express'd by his *Submission*, not only as far as *Death*, but even a sort of *Death* originally and properly belonging to *Slaves*. In this account, both of *Our Lord's Life* and *Death*, the *Condescension* is illustrated from the *Condition*, or from some *Circumstance*, of *Slaves*: Whose *Estate* was not only *low*, and *helpless*, but a *State* of *Ministration* to others. And all this agrees perfectly with the *Apostle's Design*, in urging our *Lord's Example*, to engage *Christians* not to be led by *Pride*, but to *condescend* to, and regard the *Good* of, *One another*.

2. I answer farther, that the Reason why I thus understand the Word Δεσλ in this Place, is because it signifies thus, as well when it is *figuratively* used about Those who are not really *Slaves*; as when it is peculiarly spoken only of *Them*, who are known to be so. For the using a Word, in a *figurative* way of speaking, to illustrate something to which it does not in all respects *properly* belong, does not at all alter the Signification of that Word: as I shall have occasion farther to explain.

2. The *Dean* goes on, that "with respect to
" God, the Highest Beings are Servants —
" When therefore the Form of a Servant is oppos'd
" to the Form of God, it signifies a Servant to
" God, and not a Slave to Men." To which I
answer, 1. That let the meaning of this *Passage*
be, that our Saviour by his *Humiliation* became the
Servant

Servant of God ; or of *Men*, for their Good ; it alters not the Signification of the Word Δεῦλον at all. If our being *Servants of God* be express'd or illustrated by the Word Δεῦλον ; Our *Distance* from Him, our *Obligation* to obey all his *Commands*, our *Lowest Humiliation* before Him, are thus in the best manner illustrated. The Word Δεῦλον still signifies a *Slave* ; tho' all *Circumstances of Slaves* do not belong to the *Servants of God*. 2. My Argument that in this *Passage* the *Apostle* considers *Christ* peculiarly, as *serving the Necessities of Men*, would not be taken merely from the Word Δεῦλον here made use of ; but from the design and scope of the *Passage*, to urge *Christians* to condescend in serving one another. To which purpose, I cannot esteem it a very prevailing Argument to say, " *Christ, being in the Form of God, became the Servant of God* : Therefore, do you become *Servants to one another*, in all *Acts of Benevolence and Condescension*." But the *Apostle* seems to Me, with much more Justice to argue, " *Christ being in the Form of God, condescended to become Man, &c.* " in order to promote the true good of Beings infinitely below Him : " Therefore, much more, let *Christians* be induced not to pay all their regard to themselves ; but condescend to, and serve, their Fellow-Creatures.

3. " And thus, (says the *Dean*,) our Saviour declares of Himself that He came to do the Will of God : Nor is there a single Instance to be found where our Saviour appears to be subject to the Will of Man, like a Slave," &c. What can I think, when I read such *Allegations* as these ? Have I ever once so much as hinted that *Our Saviour* was subject to the Will of Man, like a *Slave* ? Have I not said that All his *Condescension*, All his *Ministering to Others*, All his suffering for Others, was voluntary ? But can the *Dean* think this a good Argument ?

gument? Our Blessed Saviour was never subject to the Will of Man, like a *Slave*; Therefore, his Subjection to the Will of God might not, in any respect, be represented by such a *Subjection*, as that of a *Slave*: Therefore, He could not, in any Act of his Ministering to Others, or in his suffering for Others, be figuratively spoken of, in Expressions taken from thence; Therefore, neither His Humiliation, nor any one *Circumstance* of his Life and Death, could be described by any Allusion to the State of *Slaves*. I confess, nothing but the frequent *Repetition* of this Mistake thro' the *Dean's* whole Book, could make me think that I understand Him aright in what is so Unaccountable.

4. He argues that "the Angels are *Ministering Spirits, in the form of Servants*; and that Our Saviour, when He *laid aside* (as the *Dean* expresses "it) the *Form of God*, in order to Minister to "them who were to be Heirs of Salvation, then "took upon Him, [*μορφὴν δούλου*] the Form of a Servant: *i. e.* He took upon him that Form in which "he was so to Minister, and which is therefore "call'd *The Form of a Servant*." How to understand this, I confess my self at a loss, when I am told, in the same Breath, that the *Form of a Servant* here signifies a *Servant of God*; unless in this manner, that being, in many Cases, as a *Servant to Men*, He was at the same time fulfilling the *Will of God*: Which is not being a *Servant of God*, consider'd peculiarly as such; or in opposition to my Sense of *serving Others* in their Real Interest. But here, the *Dean* plainly confirms what I thought he design'd to overthrow. For, if this were the Reason why it is call'd [*μορφὴν δούλου*] the *Form of a Servant*; If he then, and not till then, put on the *Form of a Servant*, when He appear'd in order to Minister to Men; it must follow that the peculiar Signification of the *Form of a Servant*, in this place, can-

cannot be, of a *Servant of God*; but of one who came to Minister to Men, and to serve them in their Great and True Interest. This may be call'd the Form of a *Servant to God* likewise; but that is only because it was agreeable to *his Will* that Our Lord should thus take on him the Form of one *Ministring to the Necessities of Men*. But this latter is the precise Sense of the Phrase here, even according to this present Argument of the *Dean's*, as far as I can understand it. And it may be as well argued that, when our Blessed Lord wash'd his *Disciples Feet*, He did not put on the Form of a *Servant to Them*, because in that Action he pleas'd God, and (as the *Dean's Quotation* out of *Hermas* expresses it) obey'd the *Holy Spirit*, and was the *Servant of God*; as it can be in this Case, that the Form of one *Ministring to Others*, is not the Form of a *Servant to Others*, but of a *Servant to God*; because in putting on this Form, Our Lord obey'd the *Will of God*, and was the *Servant of God*. But this is not to consider the peculiar *Idea* of Words in particular places; but the possible *Comprehensive Meaning*, which may be equally applied to any particular Passage; and which cannot prove the less extensive *Idea* not to have been expressly design'd.

5. The *Dean* proceeds, p. 43, to observe that Our Saviour's Obedience to Death, is no Instance of his *Likeness* to a *Slave*. No otherwise, indeed, than as *Obedience* and *Submission*, even as far as *Death* it self, (for so the Words signify,) is an Instance of the lowest *Submission*, and of the most absolute *Obedience*: which may well be illustrated by the *Submission of Slaves*. Especially considering that St. Paul lays a stress upon the sort of *Death*; and, after having declar'd Our Lord *Obedient* as far as *Death* it self, adds, to illustrate his *Condescension*, *Even the Death of the Cross*. And here, the *Dean* owns that *Crucifixion* was not used to the *Free-*

men of Rome — But adds “that it was the *Punishment* of All Movers of Sedition in the Provinces, “tho’ they were not Slaves but Freemen.” Our Lord, (*He observes,*) was punish’d as a Mover of Sedition ; “and was carried to the Cross, because “of his *supposed* Crime, and not because of his “*Condition.*” Now, would not any *Reader* imagine from hence that I had maintain’d Our *Blessed* Lord to have been *crucified*, because He was look’d upon really as a *Slave*, by his Judge? And yet I have been as far from this, as the *Dean* himself. I allow all this to be true that He here alledges : and I infer from it *several* Things.

1. That the *Dean* might have seen, from this very Observation, that *One* who is really *not* a *Slave*, may, in some *Circumstances*, and particularly in *suffering*, resemble a *Slave*. 2. That *Crucifixion*, or the *Death* of the *Cross*, was properly speaking, a *servile Punishment* ; and appropriated to the Crime of *Sedition* for this very Reason, because it was a *servile Punishment* ; in order to make *Those*, who were *not* Slaves, to resemble Slaves in the Indignity and Dishonour of their *Death*, for the greater *Terror* to Others by such a Punishment of this Crime. 3. That Our *Blessed* Lord, (tho’ *not* a *Slave*, nor ever thought so to be, yet,) in his Obedience, even as far as the *Death* of the *Cross*, did go on, in this Particular, to take on him the *Form* of a *Slave* ; did in this condescend to resemble a *Slave*, so, as to suffer for a Crime falsely laid to his Charge : which Crime was peculiarly intitled to a *servile Punishment*. Whereas, if He had suffer’d for any other sort of Crime, (which his *Unjust Accusers* might, with equal right, have invented against his perfect Innocence,) He could not have resembled a *Slave*, in this *Circumstance* of his *Death*. From all which it appears that this *Passage* of *St. Paul* affords me, not only a *Shelter* ; but a *Demonstration* of my *Assertion* : tho’ not of the
Mistaken

Mistaken and Alter'd Assertion, which the *Dean* has in haste put upon *Me*, instead of *my own*.

But We now come, in p. 45, to the Use of the Word Δεσλ, in the *New Testament*: And we are told that "We shall find that it is far from necessarily signifying a *Slave*, in my Sense, properly so call'd." The *Dean's* Argument here is founded upon several *Passages*, in which Persons who were known *not* to be *Slaves* were call'd Δεσλ; and said Δεσλ; even tho' stil'd 'Ελευθεροι in the same Verse; and Some, in which Sons are said Δεσλ to their Fathers; and *Christians* are said, or required to serve [Δεσλ] one another. But the *Whole* of the *Dean's* Argument from these *Passages* relies upon two *Constant Mistakes*, which run thro' this Book. The one is, that a *Person*, who is a *Freeman* in one respect, cannot be said in a *Figure* to be a *Slave*, in another respect; i. e. to resemble a *Slave*. The other Mistake is, that a *Word* used *figuratively*, loses the Signification it had before it was translated to this use. As if, for instance, when the Two Warriors are call'd by the *Poet*, Duo fulmina Belli, the Word Fulmen loses the Signification of a *Thunderbolt*, because a *Man* cannot possibly be a *Thunderbolt*: Whereas the Meaning is, that those Two Great Warriors were, in *Terror* and *Destruction*, That, with respect to their *Enemies*, which (in the common Notion) *Thunderbolts* are to All that stand in their way.

And just thus it is, in every Instance here produced. When St. Paul calls *Himself* and the *Apostles* the *Servants*, or *Slaves* of Men; He means that They were, to *Christians*, with respect to any *Real Service*, and even to the lowest Offices for their *Good*, what the lowest *Slave* was, with respect to the Service of his *Master*: the Word Δεσλ still signifying a *slave*, properly so call'd, full as much when thus *figuratively* applied, as when used only of Those who are in all respects properly *Slaves*.

The

The *same* is to be said of those *Passages*, in which the *Apostles* and *Christians* are call'd upon to become Δούλοι, and Δουλεύειν, to one another. For if any one, who was inculcating upon *Christians* the *Duty* of *Condescension* in serving one another, should express it by their becoming SERVANTS, and doing the Office of Servants to one another: We might very well say indeed that the *meaning* only was, that we should think nothing too *low* for us, but be *That* to *Others*, in *some* respects, when their *Real Good* requires it, which *Servants* are to their *Masters*. But would any one say that the Word *Servants* here did not signify *Servants*, because it was, upon this Occasion, in a figure, applied to such as were *not* in that *Station*? No. The *Word* is not only the *same*, but *signifies* the *same*. The *figurative* Application of it alters not the *Sense* of it, one Tittle. There is, in all such Cases, an *Ellipsis*, which must be filled up, according to the *Circumstances* of every particular *Passage*. When the *Dean* therefore adds, “where you see, that the being a “*Servant* in the *Christian* Sense, is not inconsistent “with *Freedom*”; I know not whom it opposes, unless *Himself*. For, as for *Me*; I have been contending, Not that he who is *not* a *Slave*, is a *Slave*; but that *He* who is *not* a *Slave*, is often represented, in some particular Instances, as resembling *One*.

But I think, of all his *Quotations*, the most clear against His own purpose, is *That* from 1. Cor. vii. 22. Ὁ ἑλεύθερος καὶ δούλος ἐν Χριστῷ. *He that is call'd being Free, is Christ's Servant*: because the Word Δούλος, being here oppos'd to ἑλεύθερος, *Freeman*, can signify nothing but a *Slave*. The whole Verse is, that “*He* who, being a *Slave* with respect to *Worldly Masters*, is become a *Christian*, is the *Freeman* of *Christ*; and *He* who, being a *Freeman* with respect to *Civil Rights*, is converted to *Christianity*, becomes the *Slave* of *Christ*.” The *Dean* might have observ'd here,

here, if He had pleas'd, that, even with respect to *Christianity* it self, a *Christian* is styl'd both a *Slave* and a *Freeman*. But all this does not in the least alter the signification of the Words, *Freeman* and *Slave*. The *Ellipsis* must be fill'd up. 1. *Christ*, consider'd as redeeming *Christians* from a state of *sin*, makes Them, with respect to *sin*, what *Freemen* are, with respect to *Masters*. 2. *Christians*, consider'd as in the strictest Duty oblig'd to perform their *Master's* Will, are, with respect to *Christ*, in this particular, what *Slaves*, not freed from their *Masters* Authority, are, with respect to those *Masters*. The Application of this is very easy: and nothing plainer than that the Words *ἑλευθεροῦ*, and *δουλοῦ*, retain their proper Signification; and that the *Confusion* here arises only from the *Mistake* of supposing a real *Alteration* made in the Signification of Words *figuratively* made use of, by way of *Allusion*, or *Comparison*.

I have thus ventur'd a little at *Criticism*, in order to give some Account of the true and natural Foundation of what we call *Figures of Speech*. I shall only add, (with regard still to the Word *δουλοῦ* now before us,) that St. *Paul* not only uses the Word *δουλοῦ* to express the Obedience of a *Son* to a *Father*; as the *Dean* observes: but in *Gal. iv. 1.* expresses himself more plainly, *Now I say that the Heir, as long as He is a Child, differeth NOTHING from a SLAVE, [δούλος] tho' He be [κύριος] Lord of all, &c.* This way of Expression explains what would have been meant, if it had been said, *The Heir, or Son, is a Slave, &c.* That is, He differeth nothing from a *Slave*, in the following particular, of being under the Will of another. The Word *Slave* would still signify *Slave* properly speaking. Otherwise, I would venture to say that the Condition of one not really a *Slave* could not possibly be figuratively illustrated by this *Allusion*: the *Figure of Speech* not lying in any Change of Signi-

ni-

nification in the *Word* thus made use of, upon a Subject to which it does not *originally* belong; but in applying this *Word*, even whilst it still retains its own proper Signification, to *illustrate* not *All*, but only *some* particular Circumstances belonging to a *Matter* of quite another sort; without designing to express and describe the *Real Nature* of it, but only the *Similitude* it bears, in *some* respects only, to what is thus brought in, to raise or diminish the *Conceptions* of Men about it.

I have so fully vindicated My *Assertions*, with respect to our *Blessed Lord's Great Example*, that I need not say much, now I am come to the *Dean's Recapitulation*, p. 47, 48, 49. The meanest Reader has long ago seen that I have never once said, nor intimated, either that our Saviour came to be *Subject* to the *Will* of *Man*, as a *Slave bought and sold in the Market*: Or, that *He* had not a *Father* in Heaven, whose Will he came to fulfil, above his *Mother*, and his reputed *Earthly Father*; Or, that "when He " was concern'd in Civil Affairs, He govern'd himself by this Consideration, that he WAS Δῦλον, a " *Servant*;" well knowing, and having affirm'd, that He was not Δῦλον, a *Servant*, or *Slave*; and therefore, that He could have no such Consideration to govern Himself by; nay, having been as far, as the *Dean* himself, from intimating that, in any thing, or any part of his Life, He appeared to the World as really a *Slave*. What must the meanest Reader think of such *Representations* of my Sense? And how low must Controversy sink, when such things as these are urged against a *Person*, only for affirming what I have so often repeated, that I am really ashamed to repeat it again.

But the *last Point* I have now mention'd, from the *Dean*, about Our Lord's Behaviour "when He was " concern'd in Civil Affairs," is so extraordinary, and so much mistaken, that One cannot well imagine what could

could move Him to introduce it. For it is evident that the paying the *Tribute*, mention'd *Matth. xvii. 24.* which was the *Tribute* to the *Temple*, as the *Dean* himself calls it, was as far distant from our Lord's being concern'd in *Civil Affairs*, as what relates to the Place of God's *Worship*, is distant from the Concerns of *Civil Subjects*, consider'd as such. It is plain to any one who reads this part of the *Gospel*, that Our Lord did not mean, by the *Question* put to *St. Peter*, to plead his Exemption, "looking upon himself not as a Subject of Man," but from his being the *Son of God*; and therefore not the *Servant of God*, in the Sense the *Other Jews* were: from *Whom* therefore, God might reasonably expect this *Tribute* towards his *Temple*, tho' it could not be suppos'd to be expected from his *Son*; *Children* being rather thought to have a Share in what is paid by *Servants* and *Subjects*, than to be oblig'd by the Burthens laid upon *Servants* and *Subjects*. And it is as manifest that Our Lord did not do this, *that He might comply with the Character of a Subject*, [*i. e.* a *Civil Subject*;) because the *Character of a Civil Subject*, (and this in a *Province*, at that time, Subject to the *Roman Emperour*;) has no more relation to this matter of *Tribute* to the *Temple*, with which the *Emperour* concern'd not himself, than the *Tribute paid by the Sea* to *Christ*, or any the like *Flourishes of Rhetorick*, have to do with the Subject of a *Paragraph*, design'd for *Argument*, and not for *Entertainment*.

It is hardly worth while to observe farther, upon this occasion, that I have been so far from contradicting what the *Dean* adds about our *Saviour's* suffering, in order to fulfil the *Will of God*; that I have expressly affirm'd it long ago, in the *Controversy* to which all this originally belong'd; in order to fix the *Distinction* between our *Blessed Lord's Behaviour*, and the *Duty of Civil Subjects*, consider'd

as such. But as for what the *Dean* says, “He has
 “before observ’d: viz. that all the Circumstances
 “of his Trial were such as denoted his *Appearance*
 “to be that of a *Subject*, and not of a *Slave* ;” I
 have already consider’d them ; and shewn that They
 are no more against *My Assertion*, than against *His*
own. If He would have it here understood that
 Our Lord suffered as a *Civil Subject*, so as to be
 an *Example* to them in every Circumstance of his
 Sufferings ; He has himself just now contradicted
 this, by affirming that Our Lord suffer’d in order
 to fulfil the Will of God about Himself, declar’d
 by *Prophecies* : Which cannot be the *Case* of *Civil*
Subjects, any more than it can be their Duty to
 give up themselves to their Enemies ; as our Lord
 did. If He means any thing against *My Assertion*,
 I am forced to repeat again, that a *Person* tried by
 a *Civil Judge*, even under the notion of a *Civil*
Subject ; and neither really a *Slave*, nor thought to
 be so ; may, in several Particulars, resemble a *Slave* :
 and many Circumstances of his *Condition* and *Beha-*
viour may be illustrated by *Allusions* to the State of
Slaves.

I have now follow’d the *Dean* thro’ every *Parti-*
cular, which He has alledg’d against the Reasons,
 upon which I founded my *Assertion* : And must now
 beg leave to observe that, after I had produced
 those *Reasons*, I added under several Heads, what
 might plainly be argued upon *this Subject*. Two of
 these *Particulars*, He says something to, towards
 the beginning of his Book : to which I must there-
 fore now go back.

One is the *Fifth* of the *Observations* I made†. But
 before He begins, p. 10. He tells the *Reader*, by
 way of *Preface*, that “the Reasons which I my self

† *Ans. to a Cal. p. 15.*

“produced to the World, are so far from satisfying
 “even *My self*, that I seem not willing to rest the
 “Cause upon them ; but have given such an Inter-
 “pretation of My own Words, quoted by the
 “Dean, as is inconsistent with the Common Use of
 “Language, and with Common Sense. I will in-
 “sert, says *He*, the Paragraph entire, where His
 “Lordship comes to the *Pinch* of the Case.” Then
 follows the Paragraph ; *Viz.* I hope it is not too
 SHOCKING to the Ears of a Christian Dean, to af-
 firm that the Example of Christ is very fit to be pro-
 posed to Slaves, in order to engage them to bear the Un-
 avoidable Evils of their Unhappy Condition, with
 Patience and Resignation : because the Apostles them-
 selves have done this. And I beg to know the great dif-
 ference between saying that this is fit and proper, in the
 positive Degree ; and saying in the Comparative, that
 this is more peculiarly fit, than to propose it to Civil
 Subjects consider'd as such. How many Mistakes
 there are within this small Compass, I will not say :
 but lay a few Observations before the Reader :
 leaving the Dean to justify his own Imagination,
 that the Reasons I produced were far from satisfying even
 My self : which, I confess, admits of no Answer.

1. He represents me as giving, in that Paragraph,
 an Interpretation of My own Words. Whereas, it is as
 evident as Words can make it, that I do not lay
 down what I there say, with respect to the Sense
 and Meaning of my Proposition ; but with respect
 only to the Shockingness of it. 2. The Interpretation
 therefore, cannot be contrary to the Common Use of
 Language, or to Common Sense ; because there is no In-
 terpretation at all. 3. This harsh Satyr is entirely
 without a Sting, because it never entred into my
 Thoughts to say, there was no Great difference be-
 tween a Proposition express'd in the Positive Degree,
 and a Proposition express'd in the Comparative, as to
 their Meaning : But as to their Shockingness. 4. The

Reason why I made this *Observation* was, because I understood the *Dean* to fix that *Shockingness* to the Word *Slaves*, made use of in my *Affertion*, in the proper lowest Sense, (as it appears that He did, thro' this whole Book.) And the *Shockingness* being placed in *this*; I argued, not that there was No Difference, but *No great Difference*, as to the *Shockingness*, between saying what the *Dean* allows, and what He so vehemently condemns. Having observ'd these Particulars, I will just touch the *Dean's* Arguments here.

1. He urges, That "He that says, *Christ's Example is very fit to be proposed to Slaves*, says what is very true. But He that says, *It is more peculiarly fit to be urged to Slaves than to Subjects*, says what will appear to be very FALSE; and I must still say, very Shocking to a Christian." As to *Truth*, or *Falshood*; I have examin'd my *Affertion* by the *Dean's* Objections: and hope, I have shewn that it is not *False*. But He mistakes the *Point* here, when He talks of *False*. A Man may publish a *Mistake*; and maintain a *Proposition*, which may be *False*; and yet it may not be shocking to a Christian, so as to make his Ears to tingle. The *Point* here was for the *Dean* to shew, that to affirm this in the *Comparative Degree* is exceedingly Shocking to a Christian; but to affirm it in the *positive Degree*, is not at all so: Or that there is a *great Difference* in these Two, not as to the *Truth*; but as to the *Shockingness* of a *Proposition*.

2. The *Dean* goes on to shew that the Example of *Christ* is fit to be proposed to *All in distress*; that is, to *All* who are in a *State of Unhappiness*: which is founded upon this, that the nearer Any Persons come to that *State of Unhappiness*, which is the Ordinary and Constant Condition of *Slaves*, the more proper it is to urge the Example of *Christ* to them. And this implies in it, rather than denies, the

the peculiar fitness of that *divine Example* to the State of *Slaves*: as I have already shewn. But still, all this relates to the *Truth*, and not the *Shockingness*, of the *Affertion*. So that I am forced to repeat it, that My *fifth Observation*, before the *Dean*, related entirely to the *Shockingness* of it, and to nothing else. And all that *He* alledges here supposes me to have said, that there is no difference in *Sense* between *Fit*, and *more Fit*; which I never once thought of. *Fit*, and *more Fit*, are certainly different in *Sense*: But *Fit* for *Slaves*, and *more Fit* for *Slaves*, as to the *Shockingness* which rests upon the Word *Slaves*, are to Me much the same. And that the *Dean* fixes the *Shockingness* upon the Word *Slaves*, is evident from this, amongst other things, that the *Learned Man*, whom I was endeavouring formerly to answer, laid it down that Christ's Example, in his suffering Condition, was *more peculiarly fit* to be proposed to *Civil Subjects* than to *Slaves*: and that the *Dean*, esteeming this an *Extreme*, affirms here that the Example of Christ is *not more fitted for any one sort of Men than Another*. But He never taxes that Proposition with any such *Shockingness*, as to make the Ears of Christians tingle. From hence, I say, it is plain that He does not fix the *Shockingness* of My Proposition upon the *Falshood* of it, consider'd as *Falshood*; because he esteems this *Other* to be *False*, and yet has never treated it as thus *Shocking*, tho' it has lain before Him all this while. But,

3. The *Dean* puts a *Case*, upon My *Doctrine* about the Right of Every Christian to INTERPRET Scripture. My *Doctrine* He calls it. But, as He seems to put it, I assure Him, I neither know, nor own it. That it is fit and proper for the weakest Men to interpret Scripture, I have never, as I remember, so crudely laid down; nor any thing from which it follows: if the *Dean* comprehends under the Name of

of *Scripture*, those many *Parts* of the *Bible*, which not only the *weakest Men* cannot interpret, but which the *Wiseſt* and most *Learned* of *Mortals* have not yet shewn themselves able to interpret, so as to agree. I hope, I have never made *That* a *Right* or a *Duty*, *fit* and *proper* for all *Christians*, which is absolutely out of their *Power*. And if I had at any time so *unwarily* expressed my self, which I dare say I have not, I would now retract it. But if the *Dean* had express'd it thus, that the *Great Duties*, and *Conditions*, upon which the *Eternal Salvation* of *Christians* is declared to depend, are in the *Scripture* so plain to the *Capacities* of all *Honest Christians*, as not to need *Interpretation*; and that there is no other *Rule* to go by, but for *All Christians* to search the *Scriptures*, and to judge for *Themselves*, what those *Points* are, upon which God himself puts their *Eternal Salvation*: If He had thus express'd it, I would have own'd it; and would have defied *Him* to have pointed out any *Other Method*, which does not end in a *Popish Absolute Authority*; and in equally excluding the most *Wise* and *Learned*, as the most *Ignorant* and *Weak*, from *Judging* in *Religion*. I am sorry to find the *Dean* so ready, not only here, but in other places, to cast a little *Disgrace* upon the *Noble*, and only *Stable Principle* of *Protestantism*; upon that *Principle*, which every one of the *Best Writers*, and every *Man* who has truly defended the *Religion* of *Protestants*, ever esteem'd the *Basis* of the *Reformation*. I wish He would furnish *Us* with a *Better*; or, at least, let us know what *Equivalent* He has discover'd for it; before He discards the *Right* of *Christians* to make the *Best* of their *Bible*, as He expresses it in another *Place*.

The *Dean* goes on thus, " But should I tell Him
 " that He appears to me to affirm, *That it is much*
 " *more peculiarly fit for the Weakest Men to interpret*
 " *Scripture*"

“ *Scripture*, &c. I am afraid He would complain of
 “ very ill Usage. And yet, why should He, if
 “ there be no great difference between the two
 “ Forms of Expression?” Can any one possibly
 imagine how this is any *Answer* to what I said,
 whether it be suppos’d to relate to the *Truth* of my
Assertion, or to the *Shockingness* of it? For, 1. Here
 is an *Instance* given of *One Proposition*, founded up-
 on a *Declaration* reported as mine that *All Christians*
have an equal Right to interpret Scripture; and of *An-*
other, which directly contradicts it. Whereas, in
 the Case before us, what I had laid down relied
 upon this, that Christ’s Example was Not equally
 proper to be propos’d to Christians consider’d as
 Civil Subjects, as to some other Christians consider’d
 as *Slaves*. But then, 2. I was speaking only of the
Shockingness fix’d upon one Word in my *Proposition*:
 And the *Dean* applies his *Parallel* only to shew that
 the saying a thing in the *Positive Degree*, differs in
Sense from saying it in the *Comparative*.

4. Another Argument is this: “ He that says,
 “ It is peculiarly fit for Slaves does imply that
 “ there is *some* degree of Unfitness in it with re-
 “ spect to Subjects,” Now, 1. Some degree of
 Unfitness is not a Total Unfitness: And therefore,
 this is only the very *Point* in Debate, as to the
Truth or *Falseness* of *My Assertion*: which I have
 handled all through the foregoing Pages; and if it
 be found *True*, this is no *Objection* at all. 2. This
 again is nothing to the *Shockingness* of it: which
 was the only Point now before Him. For, 3. The
Dean himself in the same Page allows that *It may be*
True, that *Christ’s Example is more fit to be propos’d*
to the Low and Distress’d, than to the Fortunate and Rich.
 And yet this implies in it *some degree of Unfitness*,
 with respect to the *Fortunate*, &c. But, 4. If He that
 says *It is more peculiarly fit for Slaves than for Sub-*
jects, does imply that there is *some degree of Unfitness*
 with

with respect to Subjects; then, *He* that says *It is more peculiarly fit for Subjects than for Slaves*, does imply that there is some degree of Unfitness with respect to Slaves. Now that *Learned Writer* whom I was considering, maintain'd this latter. And therefore, *He* comes equally under the *Dean's* Censure; if the Crime lies in implying some degree of Unfitness in *Our Lord's Example*, as to some particular sorts of Men. And I am very well content to suffer from the *Dean*, in so good Company. But indeed, 5. This implying that there is some degree of Unfitness, in the proposing *Christ's Example* with respect to a particular sort of Men, is no very terrible Matter: It is no more than implying that, *Comparatively speaking*, there are more *Circumstances* in one Condition of *Humane Life*, which make that Example proper to be applied to it; than there are in *Another*. And this is no more than such a degree of Unfitness, as it pleased *Our Lord Himself* that *His Great Example* should have in it.

The *Other Passage* the *Dean* takes notice of here, is *That* in p. 16. of my *Ans. &c.* where I defend my Assertion by only putting it, indeed, into other Words, viz. "That our Lord's Example is more fit to be proposed to the *Low, Poor, and Distress'd*, than to the *Fortunate and Rich*, &c. And as to this, 1. The *Dean* allows it may be true. If so; then it may be true that the Example of *Christ* is more fit to be proposed to *Slaves*, who as such are, in their ordinary Condition, *Low and Distress'd*; than to *Civil Subjects*, who are *Comparatively Fortunate*. And if it may be true; it may be said without making the *Ears of Christians* to tingle. But, 2. The *Dean* adds "And yet it will be very wrong and Shocking, in any one, to affirm that the Example of *Christ* is much more peculiarly fit to be urged to a *Beggar* than to a *Gentleman*." I know very well how this may sound when abruptly brought in; and

and I know too well what may be *Shocking*, in the Ears of the *Dean*. But the *Question* is, not what is, but what *ought to be Shocking* to a *Christian*. And this I will presume to say, that, supposing Advice and Directions to have been given to *Beggars*, amongst Others, in the *New Testament*; and supposing any Writer, in a Controversy, where it offer'd it self, had laid it down that *Christ's Example* was more fit to be proposed to *Gentlemen*, than to *Beggars*; I should not have scrupled to maintain the Contrary, keeping to the Words He had made use of; and to affirm that *Christ's Example* was in many respects more fitted for the Support of Men in the Condition of *Beggars* really in want, the lowest and most distress'd of Men amongst Us, than for *Gentlemen*. And this, which would have been parallel to what I have done, I should have done without fear of offending Those, who might have too nice Ears, to hear of so ungeentel a Condition as that of a *Beggar*; and too nice an Understanding to be sensible that No Sounds or Names ought to Shock any *Christian*, which are necessary in any serious Debate, that may arise; and with which, I am sure, *Almighty God* cannot be offended, if Men are.

But from hence likewise, it is plain that as the *Shockingness* here is put upon the Word *Beggar*; so in the other Case, it is fix'd upon the Word *Slaves*: or else, this would be no parallel. And this I observe to strengthen what I have said, under the former particular, about the *Dean's* allowing what I say, as to *Slaves*, in the *Comparative degree*, to be true and fit to be said in the *Positive*; still retaining the same Word, *Slaves*.

What follows here, I imagine might well have been spared, if the *Dean* had remember'd that when *Gentlemen*, that is *Fortunate* and *Rich* Persons, become *Beggars*, or *Slaves*, They are then in the Condition of *Beggars* and *Slaves*; that when *Kings* and *Great Persons*

come into Distress, and a *Low Condition*, They are not in this Argument consider'd as *Great Persons*, but as in that *Low Condition*; that this strengthens my *Assertion* about the *Condition* of *Slaves*, which, the *Dean* should always remember, is a *Condition* Unhappy and Distress'd, in its Nature, and *always* expos'd to Daily and Hourly Pressures and Miseries, in its ordinary, and not only *accidental* Circumstances. To Persons therefore, OF this low Condition, since He likes this Word better than IN, I affirm the *Example* of *Christ's* Humiliation, and Patience, may be more peculiarly fit to be applied, than to *Civil Subjects*, who are not, by the nature of their *Condition*, as *Subjects*, in so helpless and afflicted a Condition. And this I am ashamed so often to repeat. But every *Reader* knows, when we make a Comparison between Persons in a *Low Condition* and Persons in a *Higher Condition*, Persons in a *Miserable State*, and Persons in a *Fortunate State*, that We speak of them, as remaining in their several Conditions: and therefore, that IN, or OF, makes no difference, as to my *Proposition*, nor indeed alters my *Meaning* at all.

I now return to p. 50. of the *Dean's Book*, where He considers what was offer'd to the World in a Letter publish'd in the *Flying Post*, Jan. 18. upon which I must say a little.

1. It is plain that it was not I alone, who was allarm'd at the *Dean's Usage* of me, with respect to my *Assertion* about *Christ's Example*. Here is an Instance of a Person of great Abilities and a good Spirit; (as the *Dean* acknowledges;) perfectly unknown to Me, and likely so to continue; unconcern'd in the Matter, any otherwise than in *Common Humanity* and *Sympathy*; of such a Person, I say, moved to such a degree, as to complain publicly on my Behalf; and judging it not beneath Him even to descend to remonstrate against the *Dean's* Accu-
sation,

sation, in the Face of the World, in a Common *News-Paper*. For my self; Without doubt, I have *that* in common with other Men, to be *too much* concern'd and affected in my own Case: if a Man can be *too much* moved, when He is publicly set before the World as *offering Indignity* to His Great Lord and Master. But I hope, the *Dean* will be convinced from *this* Instance, that the *Best Judges* of such things, tho' not personally concern'd in it, were astonish'd at the *Usage*. I must the rather observe this, because He puts on the Appearance of some *Resentment* at the *Manner* in which I chose immediately to *vindicate my own Reputation*. Now here is a *Third Person* proclaiming aloud to the World his Opinion of the Matter, in this *Letter*: which the *Dean* allows to come from an *Able Hand*, and adds that it is writ in a *Spirit different* from *mine*; that is, a *Better Spirit*, as He would be understood. I will now therefore, with *His* Pernission, lay before the *Reader* some of the Expressions in this *Letter*, by which He will judge whether the *Author*, tho' touch'd with the Case, only as a Case of Common Justice, Humanity, and Christianity, has not condemn'd the *Dean's Usage* of me, in the *Conclusion* of his Book about the *Test Act*, in as strong and severe Terms, as I have done, tho' touch'd more sensibly with it, as a Case of Personal Concern to *My self*. After quoting the *Dean's Words*, that Author goes on — “ These are the Words which I would pray you to read, and mark them carefully, because I cannot call to mind that I have at ANY TIME seen a Representation of an Adversary more HARD and CRUEL, in so small a Compass, upon so slight an Occasion, than this is” — Again, “ But will not both the EARS and HEARTS of all good Christians be disturb'd and wounded more, by seeing a Churchman in a high Station — deal so freely with Another's Reputation —

M 2

“ tation

"tation and good Name, without which Men are
 "almost utterly incapacitated for doing Good", &c.
 Again, "I can hardly find what Provocation could
 "be *Great enough* to stir this *Author* [the *Dean*] to
 "bestow so bad a Character upon the *Bishop*, as He
 "does in the above-cited *Passage*, where He repre-
 "sents Him, as a Writer, who, to defend his own
 "Notions, will not STICK to say ANY thing,
 "tho' never so FALSE, IMPIOUS, or BLASPHE-
 "MOUS: For what is it else that can make the
 "*Ears of a Christian Reader to tingle?*" This was the
just Sense which the Writer of this *Letter* puts up-
 on the *Dean's* Representation of *Me* to the World.
 And he concludes thus — "The last Page (of
 "the *Dean's* Book) was nothing at all to the Pur-
 "pose in Hand — But was placed at the End,
 "to load the *Bishop* with more Ill-will, and to leave
 "the WORST Impression that COULD BE on
 "the Reader's Mind, at parting" — This is the
Writer's Sense of the sole DESIGN of the *Dean*, in
 concluding his Work with that Cruel Imputation.
 Whoever he be; I acknowledge my Obligations to
Him, as to a *Person* so tenderly affected with such
Usage of One, in whom He has no particular Con-
 cern, as to send His Sentiments of it, to be pub-
 lish'd to the World, even before I had openly ex-
 press'd My own Sense of the Injury. I now appeal to
 the *Dean* himself, whether this *Letter*, so excellently
 writt, be only a *Kind Endeavour* to blacken his *Repu-*
tation; whether I have once, in speaking of this
Imputation upon my self, either interpreted it in so
 strong Terms, or fix'd the sole Design of it so posi-
 tively, as this *Impartial* Hand has done: and there-
 fore, whether I am not justified, by so good an
 Example as the *Dean* allows this to be, from All his
Fresh Imputations heap'd upon me merely for defend-
 ing my self from his *Past Injuries*.

2. What is very remarkable, After the *Dean* has endeavour'd to shew an almost imperceptible Nicety of a Mistake in this *Author's* Staring the Case, He plainly allows that, if I had affirm'd that, in the 2d Chapter of *St. Peter*, Christ's Example is *MORE* naturally and properly urged upon, and apply'd to, the People mention'd *v. 18.* who are *Slaves*, than Those mention'd *v. 13.* who are *Subjects*; that, I say, *No Bodies Ears need to tingle.* Now there is nothing in this whole Debate more surprizing than this. Hitherto, I thought it plain that the *Shockingness* of *My Assertion* was plac'd in the Word *Slaves.* But now, it seems, this *Great* and *Terrible Shockingness* is plac'd in my speaking of the *peculiar Fiteness* of Christ's Example &c. I beg therefore,

1. That it may be consider'd that *St. Peter* could not apply the Example of Christ *more naturally and properly* to *Slaves* than to *Subjects*; unless that Example were *more peculiarly fit* to be so applied. So that, had I said that *St. Peter* did apply it more properly to *Slaves* than to *Subjects*; this would have been saying not only That he did so apply it; but that it was more *peculiarly fit to be* so applied. And yet the *Dean* allows, I might have affirm'd that which implies this, without *Shocking* any *Christian*; but not the thing which is so necessarily implied. *No Man's Ears* (it seems) *need to tingle* at a *Proposition*, which relies upon *Another Proposition*: But if I maintain that *other Proposition*, upon which it relies, presently *This must make every Christian's Ears to tingle.*

2. For a Tryal; and since *We* are now entirely upon the *Shockingness* of the *Proposition*, let any *Christian Ears* try the Two following, which I have set opposite to one another.

“ In the 2d Ch. of St. Peter, the Example of
 “ Christ is more natu-
 “ rally and properly ur-
 “ ged to *Slaves*, than to
 “ Civil Subjects.

*Slaves and Subjects; More and Less; are in them both. And in Both there is implied some degree of Unfitness in urging this Example upon Subjects, according to the Dean. Yet now, at the End of his Book, after several Arguments, which are as much against One as the Other, He allows that the Former of these, which implies the Latter, need not make Any Bodies Ears to tingle; but that the Latter, which is implied in the Former, must have that Effect. Let the Christian Reader try them an Hundred times over; and I promise My self, that if One does not make his Ears tingle, the Other will not. And let the Dean try as often to reconcile this apparent Contradiction; (for so it seems to me;) I believe, He will find it very difficult; and will be forced to leave me this Unanswerable Argument, upon his own Concession. “ If to say that St. Peter does “ MORE naturally and properly urge Christ’s Ex-
 “ ample upon Slaves, than upon Subjects, need not
 “ make any Christian’s Ears tingle; then certainly,
 “ To say that Christ’s Example is more peculiarly
 “ FIT TO BE urged upon Slaves, than upon Sub-
 “ jects, need not have any such Effect. because this
 “ whole Proposition is implied in the former, and is
 “ the Support of it; and because there is no one
 “ Idea, (whether pretended to be Shocking, or not,)
 “ contain’d in this Latter, which is not in the Former.
 “ But the Dean has now publicly releas’d the For-
 “ mer from All Shockingness. And therefore, I will
 “ ven-*

" venture, (under the *Shelter* of his own *Authority*,
 " and his *Judgment* at the *End* of the *Controversy*,
 " when he had fully consider'd that Point,) to de-
 " clare that *No Bodies Ears need to tingle* at the *Lat-*
 " *ter.*" I am sorry to find *Occasion* for so many
 Words. But I am unwilling to leave any thing un-
 touch'd of what He has said upon this Argument.
 And being come to the *End* of it, I must leave it
 to the *World* to judge between Us.

We now come, p. 55. to several *Points* of a *Per-*
sonal Nature, to justify, or make amends for, what I
 complained of, before, of this Sort. The *Dean*
 promises the *Reader* to give him the *True Reason* that
 drew that *Cruel Observation* from Him. He says,
 It was " to give an undeniable Instance of the Bi-
 " shop's running into Extremes, thro' Opposition."
 Now this *Undeniable Instance* of *My running into Ex-*
trems thro' Opposition, (as I have shewn) happens to
 bring to mind an *equally undeniable Instance* of a
 Greater Man's running into Extremes, thro' the same
 Opposition; that is, in answer to a *Difficulty* which
 lay in his way. The *Dean* has marked Us both, as
 dealing in *Extremes*, out of mere *Opposition*: and We
 must bear up, under his Censure, as well as we can.
 But one thing I cannot well account for. If his In-
 tention was only to give an *Instance* of *My running*
into Extremes, thro' Opposition; Why was it not said
 so, and there left? Why was the *Instance* given,
 not handled as a *Mistake* committed thro' *Hast*, or
 some *Humane Frailty* common to every Writer?
 Why was the *Doctrine* first presented entirely de-
 vested of all its favourable *Circumstances*? Why the
Tingling of Christian Ears brought in, to heighten
 the *Distress* of the *Tragedy*; and to leave the very
Worst Impression possible upon his *Reader*?

The *Dean* proceeds to tell us that He made this
Observation, " to induce the *Reader* to consider the
 " *True Ground* upon which the present *Controversy*
 " with

“ with the *Bishop* stands. For (adds He) this is
 “ the Case in almost every Article of it. His Lord-
 “ ship, not content to oppose what is wrong, suf-
 “ fers his Zeal to carry Him into very Unjustifiable
 “ Extremes.”

1. As to the *True Ground* upon which any Contro-
 versy stands, I confess, I always understood it to be
 the *Arguments* made use of, for the support of each
 Side of it. But I find now, the *True Ground* upon
 which a *Controversy* stands, to be the *Propositions*
 which the *Writer* maintains; not the *Proofs* or *Sup-*
ports of these *Propositions*: That is, The *True*
Ground upon which a *Controversy* stands, is not the
Ground upon which it stands; but the *Controversy* it
 self, or the *Points* standing upon such *Grounds*.

2. Let the *Reader* judge how *Consistent* an *Ac-*
count this is with the *Imputation* it self laid upon Me.
 The *Dean* accuses me, not merely of *running to Ex-*
trems; but indeed of not *sticking* at any thing, be-
 cause it stands in my way, and in particular, of vent-
 ing a *Doctrine* which will make the *Ears* of a *Chri-*
stian to tingle! Upon which He warns his *Reader*
 against a “ *Writer*, so fond of his own Notions, as
 “ to take *such Steps* to defend them.” And this it
 seems, now was design’d “ to induce the *Readers* to
 “ CONSIDER the *True Ground* of the *Present Grand*
 “ *Controversy*.” Whereas, it is as plain as Words can
 make it, that the *Design* was to prejudice the *Reader*,
 and to induce Him NOT to *consider* at all the *Grounds*
 upon which I profess to establish My Part of the
Controversy; but to discard *Them* at once, only as
Rash Extremes of One, who opposes any thing, and
 maintains any thing, merely because it serves his
 present *Argument*. But amidst all My Unhappi-
 nesses, I cannot but congratulate My self upon One
 Happiness; which I think I ought to value: and
 that is, The *Testimony* which the *Dean* has here ho-
 nour’d me with, that I have opposed what is WRONG
 The

The *Instances of My Unjustifiable Extremes* now follow in great plenty.

1. The *first* Instance is this, "Because some have laid too much stress upon a *Regular Succession* of the *Clergy*, and confined the *Validity* of the *Gospel* *Institutions* to it, without allowing for Cases even of *Necessity*; Therefore, His *Lordship*, not troubling Himself to consider what regard ought to be paid to a *Regular Succession*, and what not; calls *It*, in contempt, *The Invention of Men, Vain Words, Niceties, Trifles, Dreams.*" And for *This*, as well as most of the *Other Instances*, My *Preservative* is quoted: a Book, which I truly thought He would rather have chosen not to have named in this *Controversy*, for some *Reasons* which I need not mention to Him. But,

1. The *Regular Succession*, which I ever call'd *The Invention of Men*, or a *Nicety*, &c. was no other, but a *Regular Uninterrupted Succession*, expressly consider'd as something made absolutely necessary to the *Eternal Salvation* of *Christians*. This is plain in the *Passages* refer'd to, by the *Dean*; and has been plainly declared by *Me*, in my *Answer to the Report*: Which makes me now ask, whether *Humanity*, not to say *Justice*, should not have oblig'd the *Dean* to have given his *Reader* My own true *Real Sentiments*; and not to have represented me as calling *It*, that is, a *Regular Succession* in general, by *Those Names* which I never bestow'd upon *It*, but upon something quite different from it. The *Dean* himself acknowledges even a *Regular Succession*, thus made absolutely necessary, to be an *Unwarrantable Extreme*; and consequently, the *Invention of Men*, &c. Much more, is a *Regular, Uninterrupted Succession*, of which I had occasion to speak. Therefore, in *Condemning Me*, He condemns *Himself*. 3. If He had not thought it too *Low* and *Tedious* a *Work*, to regard what I wrote last upon *this Subject*, He

N

would

would have found that I "have consider'd what " *Regard* is to be paid to the *Clergy*," in as Regular a Succession, as the nature of things admits of; and what not. But in the *Preservative*, I had not the least Occasion to do any thing more than to destroy *That Principle* of our Enemies, which He himself, I hope, intends here to declare to be an *Unwarrantable Extreme*.

2. In the next Instance, He is pleased to allow again that "Some have claim'd such a Power of Excommunication, as is indeed inconsistent with " the Terms of the Gospel, and the Reason of Man." One Instance of this is Dr. *Sherlock*, in that Passage of his famous *Sermon* long ago, in which He speaks of "Church Punishments taking effect in the other " World." But the *Dean* of *Chichester* seems to think it an *Extreme*. In opposition to which, He represents Me, as passing over the *True Use* of *Excommunication*, &c. and as representing *Humane Excommunications*, *Benedictions*, *Absolutions*, as *Humane Engines*, &c. For this likewise, the *Preservative* alone has the honour to be produced. Now, in the *Preservative*, all the World knows that I was only speaking of these *Humane Sentences* as made absolutely necessary to the *Salvation* of *Christians*; and applied by our *Nonjurors*, as well as *Papists*, to terrify *Christians* into their *Communions*. These, thus understood, He will, I hope, acknowledge to be *Inconsistent* with the *Terms* of the *Gospel*. Against these alone, so understood, I speak in the *Preservative*. And yet, He is pleased to reckon up amongst My *Extremes*, what I say in conformity, as I verily believe, to his own present Sentiments; and in opposition only to what He himself acknowledges to be *Extremes* of a heinous Nature. But He carefully avoids to refer to my *Answer* to the *Committee*, in which He knows very well that I had occasion to consider this Matter farther; and to shew that I

agreed

agreed with his own *last Thoughts* declared upon it; and to fix the *Sense*, and *True Use* of *Excommunication*.

3. "Because some (says the *Dean*) claim an Unwarrantable Power to the Governours of the Church, over particular Members: Therefore, His Lordship, not endeavouring to shew the just Limits of Church-Power, declares there is No Power in the Church; That no one of Christ's Subjects, more than Another, hath Authority to Judge, Censure or Punish the Servants of Another Master, in Matters relating purely to Conscience and Salvation." I answer,

1. That I have any where declared "there is No Power in the Church, is so new to me, that I must beg leave to call it *The Invention* of the *Dean*; and a *Dream*, tho' not a *Trifle*; and so, to leave Him to answer for it. And, 2. When He has answer'd for *that*, He must answer here again, for not referring his *Reader* to My Answer to the Report, in which I have shewn that this Sentence, now quoted out of my *Sermon*, denies nothing but what All Protestants deny; and particularly, that it leaves to the Church all that Power, which the *Dean* himself has thought fit hitherto to Own himself to contend for: and indeed, that there is no *Medium* between This, and what the *Dean* must allow to be an Unwarrantable Extreme.

4. The *Dean* proceeds. "Because some claim an Unjustifiable Authority to impose Articles of Faith, and their own Interpretations of the Scripture, as such, on the Christian People: Therefore, His Lordship, not considering that many Christians cannot read; that more of them cannot read the Scriptures without an Interpreter, affirms, with respect to All Christians equally, That the Scriptures in necessary Points, Need No Interpreter." Now,

1. If this "Claim of an Authority to impose Articles of Faith, or Interpretations of the Scripture, as such, upon the Christian People," be an *Unjustifiable Claim*; (as the *Dean* allows;) then, the *Christian People*, [which Expression of the *Dean's* includes all *Christians* equally, as much as any Expression made use of by *Me* can do,] are not obliged to receive those *Interpretations*. He himself therefore, is here so good as to join with *Me*, in that *Extreme* which He in Words condemns. He himself, "not considering that many *Christians* cannot read, and that more of *Them* cannot read the *Scriptures* without an *Interpreter*," affirms, with respect to *All Christians* equally, That they are not obliged to receive the *Interpretations* of *Others*. What then remains? Why, nothing but this, That the Necessary Points of Duty, upon which their Eternal Salvation is DECLARED to depend, must be supposed to be so PLAIN, as to need no *Interpreter*: because, if they were not so, God would have provided *Interpreters*, whose *Interpretations* it should be the Duty of the *Christian People* to submit to. Nor can the *Dean* himself find out any *Medium* in this Case.

2. If he means that many *Christians* cannot read their *Native Language*; and that more of them cannot read *Greek*, and *Hebrew*: besides that this is as much against *Himself*, who maintains that the *Christian People* are not bound to receive the *Interpretations* of *Others*, as against *Me*; the latter part of it likewise holds as strong against *Multitudes* of the *Clergy* themselves, who, in many parts of the *Christian World*, are not skilled in those *Languages* so as to understand them. And what then must the *Christian People* do, when their *Interpreters* themselves equally need *Interpreters*? But,

3. I think this is descending very low indeed. For all who can read, or hear, supposing them in their Senses, I am certain, might understand that

I was not speaking of the *Scriptures* needing no *Interpretation* in the most necessary Parts : meaning by *Interpretation*, the *Translation* of them out of the *Learned Languages* into the *Native Language* of every Country : but that, consider'd either in their *Original Languages*, with regard to *Those* who understand those *Languages* ; or in their *several Translations* ; the *Necessary Points*, upon which God has declared *Eternal Salvation* to depend, are so plain, that *Those* who can either read, or hear them, need *No Interpreter* for the Understanding them. If they do ; I am sure the *Dean* has not done well to call the *Claim* of an Authority to Interpret for *Others*, an *Unjustifiable Claim*. Nay, if *They* do ; not *I* only, but the *Greatest* of all *Protestant Writers*, fall under this Censure. I will venture to give *Another Instance* of My running into *Extremes*, and affirm that, according to this way of Reasoning, there is an *End* of the *Protestant Cause* ; and will undertake to shew, upon the same Principle, that *Christians* (unless it be a *select Number*) have no Right to make the *Best* of their *Bibles*, in the *Dean's Phrase* ; that the *Bible* is not the *Religion* of *Protestants*, as *Mr. Chillingworth* weakly thought it ; but the *Interpretations* of some or other, (tho' no Body knows who,) put upon it ; those very *Interpretations*, which in the same breath the *Dean* declares it to be *Unjustifiable* to impose upon the *Christian People*. This is what is so justly complain'd of ; viz. that the *Noblest Cause* in the World, the *Cause* of *Protestants*, is thus maintain'd and given up at the same time : and here, in the *several Parts* of the same Sentence. In the beginning of it, the *Christian People* are not oblig'd to receive the *Interpretations* of *Others* ; at the *End* of it, *They* need an *Interpreter*, even in the *most necessary Points*.

5. The Dean comes now to Another *Extreme*, relating to the *Civil Magistrate's Concern* in Matters of *Religion*. And here He quotes *My Sermon*, without once referring his Reader to my own *Explication* of my Doctrine, and *Defense* of it, in the *Answer* to the *Committee*. The Dean, methinks, should have avoided the mention of *this Instance*, above *All Others*, for fear of calling to his Reader's Mind (what has been shewn so evidently, that He himself does not care to go on expressly to deny it,) "That His Doctrine and Mine, in this particular, are the same, whether He will or no; that He and I are equally in *this Extreme*; and shall and must be so, till he has disclaim'd his *Sermon*." And this I will add, That the World will judge whether His *Active Zeal* against Me, in this particular Part of the Controversy, may not be produced as a *Greater Instance* of running to *Extremes*, thro' *Opposition*, whilst his own Doctrine stood open against Himself, in the Eyes of the World; than Any He has produced against Me: And, if he should now give it up, whether this it self has not a much greater Appearance of running to *Extremes* thro' *Opposition*, that he may more successfully condemn Me; than He has been able to fix upon Any Doctrines of mine, whether *Mistakes* or not, which the *Course* of *Argument* led me to.

As for the *Sentence* which, He here saith, I have taken no Notice of; I appeal to the *Second Chapter* of my *Answer*, whether I have not fully consider'd every thing in this *Sentence*, in considering those *Others*, to the very same Purpose, upon which the *Committee*, who were the best Judges, chose to lay the Stress of the Charge. There the Reader will find a full Proof of what I have taught about the *Magistrate*. And there he will find how much Pains I have taken to give the Dean in particular all Satisfaction, by considering at full length what He has
objected,

objected, under many *Particulars*: which He has for the present entirely pass'd over.

6. The *sixth* Instance of My running to *Extremes*, is My framing a *New Definition of Religion*, by making the *Belief of a Future State*, necessary to it: and this, in opposition to Those who urged to Me the Advantage of *Temporal Encouragements*, &c. Now, as *This* was always my Notion of *Religion*; and express'd sufficiently, before any such *Argument* was urged to Me; It could not be taken up, in Opposition to *That*, which was, in order of Time, after it. I am sorry to find this reckon'd amongst the *Extremes of a Christian*: and shall, in due Time, explain and defend it farther, in answer to some late *Objections*. In the mean while, the Dean mistakes me exceedingly, when He represents me as maintaining this, rather than I would allow *Temporal Encouragements*, when applied in the *Best Manner*, to be of any *Service to True Religion*. For I have been contending for applying them in the *Best Manner*; that is, for applying them to Those Things, to which They can be properly and effectually applied: and shewing that *True Religion* will be greatly advantaged, when They are applied, not to what they cannot reach or affect, but solely to what they properly belong to.

Before I leave these *Instances of My Unjustifiable Extremes*, I must observe that the Dean affirms Me to run into Them, in opposition to *Doctrines* which He allows to be *Wrong*, and to be likewise *Unwarrantable Extremes*: And that after this, He is pleas'd to set forth Mr. Law as a very considerable, and indeed an *Unanswerable Writer*; at least, *Unanswerable by Me*. Now, if Mr. Law lays as great a Stress upon a *Regular Uninterrupted Succession of Clergy*, in one particular *Way*, even as to the Validity of God's Ordinances, as can possibly be laid: If some of his *Main Principles*, as far as he has had occasion professedly

fessedly to state them, are Some of these very *Instances* of *Unwarrantable Extremes*, which the *Dean* blames as well as I: If He is professedly join'd with *Those* who avow no other *Principles* upon these Subjects, but These *Extremes*: Or, If His *Main Principles* can be demonstrated to lead to, and to contain, these very *Extremes*: If these Things be so; I am sorry to hear Him thus painted out, for the *Dean's* sake, as well as my own. For if He be an *Unanswerable Writer*; then, there is no such Thing as an *Unwarrantable Extreme* in these Points; then, the *Dean's* Cause, as well as mine, is in danger; then, the Cause which Mr. L. is serving, is much better than I hoped it was; and then, These *Doctrines*, which the *Dean* has mark'd for *Unwarrantable Extremes*, are *Truths*, *Unanswerable* by Him, as well as by Me. But I hope better Things, for His sake, as well as my own: and that He will allow Me to take the Other side of the Question, and to argue that *These*, which the *Dean* has mark'd, are the *Unwarrantable Extremes* of Mr. Law himself; notwithstanding that He seems sometimes to unsay and contradict his own *Principles*: And that therefore, He cannot be, in the *Dean's* Opinion, so very *Considerable a Writer*, as to be thought *Unanswerable*.

And now, I appeal to every *Reasonable Man*, as the *Dean* here does; and ask, Whether it be not an *Excellent Method* of *Controversy*, to dictate from the *Chair*, that *My Doctrines*, upon the *Points* here mention'd, are *Unjustifiable Extremes*; and *Extremes* maintain'd merely thro' *Opposition*; and at the same time to disdain the *Low* and *Tedious Work* of producing or examining the *Proofs* alledged for them; nay, at the same time, to disavow those *Contrary Doctrines*, between which and mine, there is *No True Medium*; and to produce, as one *heinous Extreme* of mine, even a *Doctrine* which He himself has publicly taught, long before Me? The Point

to any *Christian*, or *Protestant* is, Not whether These *Doctrines*, as I have taught them, are *Extremes*: but whether They are *True*. As to this, I have taken a great deal of Pains to *prove* it. And He has said nothing against any of my *Proofs*.

In p. 59. the *Dean* comes closer to the *Point* of *Personal Reproaches*. He first says, "He could give a Catalogue of Abuses that have been cast upon Him by Me, and my Friends. But he does not think fit YET to trouble the World with them." When He shall please to publish his *Catalogue*, I leave it upon his Conscience to lay no more upon Me, than what I have publickly own'd. For I solemnly protest, not only that I have my self never abused Him, nor been pleas'd with Any thing in Others which look'd like *abusing* Him; but that I have never, either directly or indirectly, encourag'd one single Instance, of so much as *Severity* of Expression towards Him. But if He has written in such a *Manner*, that even *By-standers*, and *Unconcern'd Spectators* of our Behaviour, have been moy'd to express their Sentiments of it: I am not to be blamed for this; but I know, who is. And whenever He thinks fit to publish this *Catalogue*; He must expect that They, who are concern'd in it, will present Him with a *Catalogue* as long, and as remarkable, of the many *Notable Incidents*, which were the Occasion of their Observations and Severity.

This was design'd to introduce *One Instance* of My *Charity* towards Him. And if I have pass'd thro' all that the *Dean* has laid upon me, with *One* only Return of this sort; I hope, there will be room for an *Excuse* from *Humane Frailty*; especially upon My *Repentance*. The Instance is, That *Passage* in my *Postscript* to Mr. Sykes, in which I tell the *Dean*, "I did not at all doubt the Truth of what He had said, that He could not have been silent in Convocation, if He would maintain the Trust reposed in Him." This, (after

(after having spoken of it with much more Temper in another Book, and not seen it in so frightful a Light,) He now exaggerates — He says, “ This “ is a Reflexion which dives into the very Heart, “ and fixes the Imputation of *Disbonesty* there. ’Tis “ all *Invention*.” And again, “ This Reflexion--- “ at once takes away the Reputation of *Honesty*, and “ common *Morality*.” If it does; I solemnly profess, It is not *my Reflexion*: because *My Reflexion* implied no such horrid Things in it. The utmost that is implied in that *Expression*, is, That the *Dean* had *undertaken* in particular for Himself, that He would be *One*, amongst *Others*, to oppose, and to censure, *My Doctrines*. To this Purpose He met and consulted with *Others* more than once. And I think it but a very Easy and Natural Figure of Speech, to say that this, after such a Zeal and Readiness in him to *undertake* it, became a *Trust* reposed in Him, by *Those* who had a Zeal either against *Me*, or my *Doctrines*: Which *Expression* however, I should not have used, nor thought of, had not *He* himself led me to it. Now, seriously and impartially speaking, had I, in giving a Turn to his own Words, gone too far; and suppos’d Him to have *undertaken*, what He never *undertook*; and *Others* to expect of Him, what They never did expect from Him; this would go no farther than too forward an *Imagination* of his Zeal against *My Doctrines*, of which I could not give positive Proof. But I will defy *Him*, and All that deal in Words, to shew that in this *Expression* any *Imputation* of *Disbonesty* is implied; or any thing more *vile* and *profligate* than this, that He had *undertaken* a particular Part against *Me*, upon this Occasion. I will go farther, and say, that it does not so much as imply that He was moved to *this* Part by any *Personal Resentment*: tho’ if I had intimated so much, it would have been no more than what *Another Person*, join’d in the same Cause, has *ingenuously*

almost confess'd; and what I could have given some little Proof of from hence, that the *Part* which He chose, was *That*, in which He himself had preach'd the *same Doctrine* he oppos'd. But I aver that this *Sentence* of mine, brought as an Instance of *All Uncharitableness* heap'd together, does not imply in it that the *Dean* acted this *Part* against his Conscience, or *Disbonestly*. He might undertake it, and it might be a *Trust* reposed in him, agreeably to his own present Judgment: a *Point*, which this *Sentence* leaves as it found it; and therefore, is perfectly free from so heavy and surprizing a Charge as the *Dean* fixes upon it now, after not seeming at least so to understand it, before he wanted an *Instance* of *Recrimination* to return for the many with which He has favour'd Me.

As for my saying that I would never suffer, upon any Account in the World, *Any such Trust* to be reposed in Me; or, in other Words, that I would never engage in any such Methods against the *Dean*; This only shews what I think; but is far from imputing it to Him, that He might not think them *Allowable* Methods. I have, I confess, other Notions of such Matters. I cannot persuade my self that it is the *Duty* of *Clergymen*, to employ that Time, in censuring the *Meanest* or the most *Erroneous Writer*, by *Authority*, which might be so much better employ'd, and so much more, (I truly think,) for the Honour of God, and the Propagation of *Truth*, in answering and confuting Errors, with the *Reason* of Men, and the *Temper* of *Christians*. And therefore, I do assure him again (as far as one can judge in a Case of that Nature,) I believe sincerely, I should rather have suffer'd almost any worldly Evil, than have undertaken *such a Part* against Him, even supposing Me not to have liked several of his *Doctrines*. But this is far from supposing that He acted against his own Conscience, or his own Principles, at that time. I am

sure, I left it *then* to his Conscience ; and to *that* I leave it still : and therefore, I am certain, here is No Imputation of Dishonesty or Profligateness.

The Reasons I had to think, as I *then* did, were such as I could not doubt of, from all the Accounts I receiv'd of the Beginning and Progress of some Proceedings ; and they were confirm'd by several Passages in the Dean's first Answer to Mr. Sykes, which occasion'd My Postscript : particularly by the Form of a Terrible Adversary there put on, when it was declar'd that " if I should pretend to justify My Sermon, I shou'd find that I had a Matter of another Nature upon my Hands, than ever yet I was engaged in.— That as for himself, He would neither be afraid nor ashamed to own the Cause— That He would take his Share in the Common Defense of the Representation of the Committee, in which he had CONCURRED." This, I say, confirm'd Me in my Notion of the Part he had undertaken to act. But, as to what is now before Us, I do absolutely deny that " to say of Another, that he has undertaken a Trust against Me, which I would not upon any Account have undertaken against Him, does imply in it, Any Dishonesty, Immorality, Vileness, or Profligateness (in the Dean's aggravating Language) in that Person ; either that He undertook this against his own Conscience ; or any thing like it." And therefore, this is not a Parallel to the Least of Those Severities I have experienced ; much less, to the Greatest. If I am mistaken in this Interpretation ; and it can be prov'd that this Reflexion " dives into his Heart, and fixes Dishonesty and Vileness there ;" I will not follow Great Examples : but will in the first Place, in Justice to My self, disown it as My Reflexion ; and then publicly disown it, as unworthy of a Christian.

I am

I am sorry to be obliged by the *Dean* to compare *My self* with *Him*, upon any Account: but much more so, upon this Head. But certainly, it must amaze *All Readers* to find themselves forced to call to mind what, I should think, He might have permitted Them to forget, if they would. Let but any one look back a little; and remember the *Humane Comparison* of my Behaviour to that of *Domitian**. Let Him but call to mind that *Christian Insinuation*† that by No Views I have sometimes meant, Such as are consistent with doing the very thing denied professedly; to which, as it is plainly design'd to regard and support a particular *Publick Defamation* of Me, upon the tenderest Point in the World, I can return nothing but Pity and Pardon. Let Him but remember the Insinuation‡ of “*My encouraging One to abuse the whole Clergy of the Nation, in order to exalt my own Character*; and the like. Let Him go no farther back than the *Hard and Cruel Imputation* of offering *Indignity* to Our Blessed Lord Himself; of sticking at nothing if I can but get clear of a present Difficulty: Let Him then think of the Continuation of *this*, by the moving Title of *Our Blessed Lord Vindicated*, in answer to the *Bishop of Bangor*: Let him consider the Character included in that Passage of his last Book, p. 13. in which the *Dean* sets me forth as *having too much Sense to defend, and too little Ingenuity to retract, a Falshood*. When the Reader does but think of these few Particulars, out of *Many*; I leave it to his Choice, whether He will wonder more at the *Dean's* unprovoked Usage of *Me*; or at his forcing the World back to the Remembrance of the many Instances of it: which for the present, I am sure, might have

* *Considerations*, p. 66.

† p. 60.

‡ p. 70.

lain buried in Forgetfulness, as far as the nature of things could admit ; if He had not made it impossible not to mention them, by declaring this single Instance to have exceeded *All that He has said, put together.*

Before the *Dean* concludes, He mentions my Complaint that He did *not answer every thing writt against Him.* I must beg leave to assure Him that *this likewise is an Invention.* I know of no such Complaint ; and I am certain, I made no such Complaint. I observ'd indeed a Matter of quite another Nature, *Not* that the *Dean* had not answer'd *Every thing* writt against Him ; but that He forsook those Points, in which he had openly appear'd, and which He had challeng'd *Me* to enter into ; and, without any notice of what had pass'd between *Us*, now step'd forth as a *New Writer* ; took a *New Subject*, and began a *New Account.* This was as natural and unavoidable an *Observation*, as it would have been upon *Me*, if, instead of answering to the *Objections* propos'd against My *Doctrine*, by the *Dean* and the Rest of the *Committee* ; even after I had enter'd into a *Debate* with Them ; I had entirely abandon'd the *Subject* ; took a *New Theme* ; and writt a *Treatise* about the late *Rebellion* against King *GEORGE* ; or in defense of the *Act* of *Succession.* When the *Dean* therefore, descends so low, as to tell *Me* that " I have had *discretion* enough to let " some things go unanswer'd, and particularly Mr. " *Law's* two Letters ; a Writer, so Considerable, that " He knows but *one* good Reason, why I do not an- " swer Him ;" I think,

1. It is plain, the *Dean* forgets that I never once undertook this Task ; that I never invited Mr. *Law* into My *Labyrinths*, with a publick Assurance that I would undertake to *shew him the way out again* ; that I never either *attack'd* Him, or *promis'd* to follow him. And indeed, as I have never endeavour'd to lessen the

the Weight of Mr. Law's Arguments by throwing any *Personal Contempt* upon Him: so, I have hitherto seen no Reason in the World to think my self obliged to answer *Him*, in particular, above any one *Writer* that has ever appear'd against *Me*. But as *Considerable* a *Writer* as Mr. Law is; I hope the *Committee*, as a *Body*, are much more *Considerable*, in the *Dean's* Eyes; I'm sure, They are in *mine*. And I hope, The *Dean* of *Chichester* will at least pardon me, that I have thought *Him* himself a much more *Considerable Writer* than Mr. Law; and spent so much of my *Time* upon *Him*, and the *Committee*, that I had none left to employ any where else. I still follow the *Dean* where *He* leads me: and this has been hitherto almost constant Employment for all the *Time* I have at Command.

2. He knows but *one* good Reason why I do not answer Mr. Law. I will presume to tell Him more than one. The *first* is, because there have been *Three* Excellent Answers written to his *First Letter*; to the Particulars of which Mr. Law has not thought fit to make any *Reply*. There have been *Two* publish'd to his *Second Letter*: and a *Third* coming; from some of the Ablest Hands I know of. Another Reason is, because All the most Important of his *Objections* must be supposed to be in the Representation of the *Committee*, unless it were drawn up in vain; and must be supposed to be answer'd in my Answer to the *Report*. Add to this, that the very design of his *Second Letter* is what the Reverend Dr. Cannon highly commends the *Committee* for rejecting. But I must beg leave to say this, that as the *Dean* knows but *One* good Reason why I have not answer'd Mr. Law; so I profess, I know of but *One* good Reason why He has gone out of his way to pay this Great Regard to him; and that is, because Mr. Law had gone out of *His* way first, to Complement the *Dean's Performances* against *Me*.
But

But whatever Opinion I may have of Mr. Law, as a *Writer* in this Controversy; since the *Dean* of *Chichester*, after complaining of *Extremes*, and Unwarrantable Claims of Church-Power, &c. has been pleased to pitch upon *Him*, as too Considerable a *Writer* not to be particularly consider'd by me; I will answer *Him* in his own Words, * only leaving out the Contemptuous part of them; and what is more, I will fulfil my Promise; viz. "If the *Dean* will make these *Letters* of Mr. Law his own, by declaring that He will justify and stand to the Doctrines and Consequences of them; If He will put but a little of his Reputation upon this Issue; for *His* Sake, I may [I will] submit to this Employment." I confess, I am the more free of my Promise, because I am fully satisfied, the *Dean* will not put one tittle of his Reputation upon this; and that He will not publicly own any One of Mr. Law's Main Principles, or Main Charges against Me; as Considerable a *Writer*, as He here represents Him to be.

Nothing remains, I think, to be observ'd but a Wonderfull and Sudden Change of Persons, in the *Dean's* Representations, p. 62. Hitherto Mr. Sykes has been my Second: but now, I am *His*. I was once the Consul; and He the Slave. But now, He is the Consul; and I ———. I esteem both the sides of this Complement to be equally an Honour to my self: because He is a *Writer*, whom I could not be proud of having for a Second, if I did not agree in Judgment with him enough to be *His* Second. But here again I think, the *Dean* is unkind to *Himself*, in this piece of Satyrical Contempt, rather than to Me. For certainly it must be unaccountable to All, who have not been used to observe

* Consider. p. 65.

with what *Dexterity* He calls *Himself* to remembrance, in *All* his Reproaches upon *Others*: I say, It must be *Unaccountable* to All such, that a Person of *His Abilities*, should here reproach Me (as He thinks) with *inserting* many things in *my Answer*, at *Second Hand* from Mr. Sykes; when *He* himself, in his *Considerations*, p. 65. had challeng'd Me to "make what Mr. Sykes had said *my own*, and to put a little of *my Reputation* upon it; that so He might have the Temptation of lessening my Reputation, to induce him to submit to the *Employment* of answering it. If I had not enter'd at all into *this* part of the *Controversy*; this *Defiance* had it self stood for a *Compleat Victory*. But having accepted the *Defiance*, and enter'd; Now, instead of *submitting* to the *Employment* of answering; *Contempt* is to come in it's place. It is *all* (it seems) *inserted* at *Second Hand* from Mr. Sykes! So that doing the very thing which He invited Me to do, is now made *my Reproach*; and what he said would induce *Him* to *Answer*, is made the very *Argument* against answering. Did ever *Writer* so dextrously lay a *Trap* for an *Adversary*; that He must be *taken*, whether he comes in to it, or does *not* come into it? But, to add a very few Words,

1. The *Matter* was indeed of such a *Nature*, that I was of necessity oblig'd to produce the same *Passages*, in proof of the *Dean's Doctrine*, which Mr. Sykes had done; or else I must have invented *New Passages* and *New Sentences*. But there is this *Accidental Circumstance*, which happens to make it impossible that I should have inserted any thing of this, at *Second Hand* from Mr. Sykes; *viz.* That the *Main* of this part of *My Answer* was occasion'd, not by the *Dean's* first Answer to Mr. Sykes, but by *His Considerations*; and did not so immediately refer

to the *General Doctrine* of my *Sermon*, as to the *particular Positions* maintain'd against *Me* in those *Considerations*, about the *Magistrate's* judging of the *Intention*, and not the *Outward Action* only: which *Positions* it happen'd that the very *Words* of his *Famous Sermon* more *flagrantly* and *immediately*, (tho' not more *really*) contradicted, than they did the *General Doctrine* depending upon those *Positions*: and *this*, without any *Possibility* of hiding this *Contradiction* in *General Terms*, or by any *Evasions* and *Colours*.

2. What I inserted in this part of the *Controversy*, was really not at *Second Hand* from *Mr. Sykes*; but faithfully transcrib'd from the *Dean's* own *Sermon*, and from his own *Answer* and *Considerations*. These furnish'd my *Materials*: which indeed, were only his own *Contradictions*. 3. As to what the *Dean* adds, that *I have not taken the least Notice* of what *He* had publish'd in his own *Vindication*: I can only wonder; and appeal to My *Answer* to the *Report*. And if the *Meanest Person*, who can read it, is not convinced that I have truly and faithfully consider'd *All* that *He* lays the *Main Stress* of his own *Vindication* upon; and shewn that what *He* particularly alledges for his *Defense*, makes very particularly against *Him*; I will never pretend to *answer* any thing again, to the *End* of my *Life*.

I have now gone thro' the *Dean's* last *Book*. I have particularly consider'd Every Thing *He* has alledg'd either relating to the *Truth*, or to the *Shockingness*, of My *Affertion* about our *Blessed Lord's Example*. And as I can assure *Him*, that when I call'd His *Cruel Imputation* upon *Me* a *Calumny*, I did not consult my own *Passions*, in a *Case* in which I was so personally concern'd; nay, that I was not determin'd to the *Method* I took, without the *Advice* of as *Wise*, and as *Calm Heads*, as any that I have

have the Happiness to be acquainted with : So, I think, upon the Review of the Whole Matter, I have proved, even supposing *My Assertion* to have been a *Mistake*, that the *Dean's* unkind Usage of *Me*, was accompanied with every Circumstance that could be necessary to justify what I fix'd upon it.

I am very sensible how easy it is for *Humane Nature* to be too much carried away by *Resentment* in such Cases. And I cannot forbear thinking that Every Man has the quicker Sense of *Personal* and *Popular Reproaches* ; the less Occasion He has given for them, by any such *Outcries* and *Attacks* upon Others. I confess, there is hardly any thing in All the Debates I have been engag'd in, and all the *Circumstances* of them, that has given Me more real Concern, than the *Part* which the *Dean of Chichester* has chosen to act against *Me*, who was truly disposed to pay Him every Mark of *Civility* and *Respect*. But, as I hope, that *Self-Defense* is No *Crime* ; but indeed a *Virtue* and a *Debt* : So I have nothing farther to do, in the present Case, but to appeal to the *World*, whether My just and necessary *Endeavours* to preserve My OWN *Reputation*, deserve to be call'd by the *Dean*, who made the Attack, * *My Kind Endeavours to blacken HIS Reputation* ; whether My Answers to *Invectives*, ought to be stil'd † *Invectives* ; or My *Defenses* of My self against *Reproaches*, to be nam'd ** *Reproaches* ; and whether such Turns of *Dexterity* as these can hinder the *Reader* of the meanest Capacity, from seeing that the *Part* I have acted in this and the like Cases, is the *Part of Self-defense*

* *Cond. and Ex. of our Blessed Saviour Vind.* p. 3.

† *Pag. 50.* ** *Ibid.*

alone, for the unavoidable Consequences of which, I am not answerable : a *Part*, not *chosen* by Me, but *imposed* upon Me, by the Voluntary and Unprovok'd Attacks of Cruel and Publick Imputations, as far remov'd from the *Arguments* into which They thrust themselves, as from the *Benevolence* and *Tenderness* of the Gospel.

F I N I S.

Some ERRATA.

PAge 20. l. 4. for rightly read rightfully. *Ib.* l. 18. read *πῶς*. *Ib.* l. 20. read *ὑπερφύσκει*. pag. 27. l. 19. read argues. pag. 33. l. 22, and 23. read Apostles. p. 44. l. 18, and 19. read peculiarly. p. 70. l. 29. read considerable. p. 89. l. 19. read ungentle. p. 91. l. 19. read Permission. p. 92. l. 11. for was read is. p. 96. l. 24. after this put ,. *Ib.* l. 25. after seems dele , and put it after now.

In the PRESS,

A full Examination of several Important Points, relating to Church-Authority, the Christian Priesthood, the Positive Institutions of the Christian Religion, and Church-Communion: In answer to the Notions, and Principles contain'd in Mr. Law's Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor. In a Second Letter to Mr. Law; with a Postscript, wherein his Evasive Answers to Former Objections are consider'd. By Gilbert Burnet, M. A. Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty. Printed for Tim. Child, at the White-Hart in St. Paul's Church-yard.

ent
ar-
19.
19.
for
ems

lating
ne Po-
urch-
nciples
Bishop
a Post-
jections
i Ord-
at the